DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 934 PS 015 096

AUTHOR Masters, John C., Ed.
TITLE Models for Training in Child Development and Social Policy. Papers Presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development (Toronto, Ontario, Canada, April 25-28, 1985).
INSTITUTION Vanderbilt Univ., Nashville, TN. Inst. for Public Policy Studies.
SPONS AGENCY Bush Foundation, St. Paul, Minn.; Foundation for Child Development, New York, N.Y.; Grant (W.T.) Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Levi Strauss Foundation, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.
PUB DATE [85]
NOTE 56p.; Small print is used throughout monograph.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Child Development; *Curriculum; Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Models; *Program Descriptions; Program Development; *Public Policy; Self Evaluation (Groups)
IDENTIFIERS Research Training; *Social Policy

ABSTRACT

This monograph describes seven training programs at the graduate level that integrate research on child development and the formulation and implementation of policies affecting children and families. The major purpose of the descriptions is to illustrate the range as well as the commonalities among the elements of training programs in child development and social policy. The descriptions are also intended simply to familiarize the reader with the nature of training in the area. Descriptions follow a general outline which includes a brief account of the program's origin and setting followed by discussions of the program's institutional characteristics, elements of the training program, research activities, and findings of self-evaluations. A concluding commentary focuses on additional concerns. Providing an overview of the monograph, the introductory essay generally considers models for training in child development and social policy. Four of the programs described are the Bush Centers in Child Development and Social Policy that have been initiated at Yale University and the Universities of Michigan, North Carolina, and California at Los Angeles. Also described are the program in Child Development and Public Policy at Mills College, Oakland, California, the graudate minor in Psychology and Social Policy at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and the Congressional Science Fellowships in Child Development of the Society for Research in Child Development. (RH)

MODELS FOR TRAINING IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY

Edited by John C. Masters

WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY

LINDSAY CHASE LANSDALE
THOMAS DAVID
BARBARA A EVERETT
JAMES J GALLAGHER
RON HASKINS
SHARON LYNN KAGAN
JUDITH C MEYERS
EDNA MITCHELL
DEBORAH A PHILLIPS
ELIZABETH SCHREIBER
HAROLD W STEVENSON
EDWARD ZIGLER

MODELS FOR TRAINING IN

CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY

John C. Masters, Editor

Program Descriptions Prepared by:

Lindsay Chase-Lansdale
Thomas David
Barbara A. Everett
James J. Gallagher
Ron Haskins
Sharon Lynn Kagan
Judith C. Meyers
Edna Mitchell
Deborah A. Phillips
Elizabeth Schreiber
Harold W. Stevenson
Edward Zigler

Prepared for the
Module on Child Development Research and Social Policy
at the 1985 Biennial Meeting of the
Society for Research in Child Development

Contributors

Lindsay Chase-Lansdale
Washington Liaison Office
Society for Research in
Child Development

Thomas Davis
The Bush Foundation Training
Program in Child Development
and Social Policy
University of California
Los Angeles

Barbara A. Everett
Washington Liaison Office
Society for Research in Child
Development

James J. Gallagher
Bush Program in Child Development
and Social Policy
Frank Porter Graham
Child Development Center
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill

Ron Haskins
Bush Program in Child Development
and Social Policy
Frank Porter Graham
Child Development Center
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill

Sharon Lynn Kagan
The Bush Center in Child Development
and Social Policy
Yale University

John C. Masters
Vanderbilt Institute for Public
Policy Studies
Vanderbilt University

Judith C. Meyers
The Bush Program in Child Development
and Social Policy
University of Michigan

Edna Mitchell
Department of Education
Mills College

Deborah A. Phillips
National Association for the
Education of Young Children

Elizabeth Schreiber
The Bush Center in Child Development
and Social Policy
Yale University

Harold W. Stevenson
The Bush Program in Child Development
and Social Policy
University of Michigan

Edward Zigler
The Bush Center in Child Development
and Social Policy
Yale University

Acknowledgements

The preparation of this monograph was made possible by the efforts of a number of individuals and funding from several sources. Without the willing cooperation of the assembled authors, the monograph would have no substance. The impetus for assembling these descriptions came from a conference held at Vanderbilt University in March of 1983 and supported by a grant from the Levi Strauss Foundation to the Center for the Study of Families and Children of the Vanderbilt Institute or Public Policy Studies. The Editor's commitment to the effort was initiated by a grant from the Foundation for Child Development to support visits to many of the programs described and by continuing support from the Henry R. Luce Foundation. The four Bush Centers whose programs are described would not exist but for their support from the Bush Foundation. The William T. Grant Foundation in collaboration with the Foundation for Child Development have provided the funding for the Congressional Science Fellowship program in Child Development and Social Policy that is administered through the Society for Research in Child Development. And, doubtless there are others to whom acknowledgement is owed but who will hopefully be tolerant that their names escaped mention in this brief prefatory statement.

Support for the preparation and revision of this monograph was provided by the Vanderbilt Institute for Public Policy Studies, where it appears as a working paper of the Center for the Study of Families and Children.

Contents

MODELS FOR TRAINING IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY

John C. Masters

There is increasing discussion among child development researchers regarding the proper relationship between research on child development and the formulation and implementation of policies affecting children and families. For some, this concern is characterized by a conviction that issues of policy or regarding any sort of social action are best kept totally separate from the arena of scientific inquiry in order to preserve the objectivity of research and keep its direction charted by theory and prior empirical findings. For others it is an active concern that the domains of research and policy have been too separate, and policies have been only poorly informed by existing knowledge while research has not been given any direction by contemporary social issues (cf. Bronfenbrenner, 1974; or the description of the Mills College program in this monograph).

The debate between the conflicting aspects of this concern cannot be resolved by argument alone. A number of child development researchers have developed personal paths of integrating child development research (especially their own) and social policy. More importantly, several different models have developed for training that integrates the field of child development (as a research discipline) with the domain of social policy where important decisions are made that could be well advised by research findings. This document describes several programs of training that have been developed to address the need for individuals sensitive to this important interface. It is presented here both as an historical document describing pioneering efforts in this area and as a set of comparative models for those considering the development of new programs at their home institutions who can profit from the thinking and planning that others have already done.

Policy training is not historically a part of undergraduate, graduate, or postgraduate training in the several fields that

comprise child development. Indeed, providing training with a focus on social policy is almost always parallel to, rather than integrated with, training in a particular academic discipline (at the graduate level) or academic training in general (especially at the undergraduate level). It has been commented (Phillips, 1983) that policy training that is provided while one is working on an academic degree in a specific (child development) discipline essentially provides dual socialization for the participating individual. When one undertakes a separate program of policy training, such as the congressional science fellowship or the postdoctoral training in one of the Bush Centers, the training is in many ways a resocialization process.

Despite the existence of training programs that are certainly effective, it is still difficult to specify clearly or in a discrete fashion exactly what actually constitutes the gist of training in child development and social policy. Different programs concentrate on different skills ranging from logistic policy analysis to learning the ropes of the political process via an internship in some legislative office, though most programs still resemble one another in the range of skills they attempt to impart even if they vary in terms of which they emphasize and which they do not. There have been other attempts to describe the general elements of training programs in child development and social policy (e.g.,Masters, 1984) so they will not be recapitulated here. Indeed, the reader will have them well in hand after reviewing the several program descriptions that follow.

A major purpose of these descriptions is to illustrate the range as well as the commonalities among the elements of training programs in child development and social policy. These programs may exist in or outside of the academic setting. They may be externally or internally funded (i.e., through grants or as part of the host institution's internal budgeting of funds). They may be companions to a degree program, available to those pursuing a degree in a standard academic discipline but not an integral part of the degree-related training program, or they may be independent of any degree-granting institution. If tied to an academic institution, it may be large, small, state-supported, private, near a state capital or even the nation's, or quite distant. All of these factors have some influence on the shape that a given program assumes, and the descriptions provide an illustrative base for the reader who is potentially interested in developing a program in child development and social policy and wishes to learn about the typical components of such programs and how they may vary to adapt to different host settings.

These descriptions are also intended simply to familiarize the reader with the nature of training in this area. This function is important because such training is becoming increasingly available and undertaken by more and more members of the discipline of child development. In addition, examples of programs, their goals, and their contents should be informative to persons with a potential interest in this area who may not know what training possibilities exist, what the learning experience would entail, or at what point in one's education or career such training might be sought.

The training programs described in the present monograph are of several different types. Four are the Bush Centers in Child Development and Social Policy that have been initiated at the University of Michigan, the University of North Carolina, Yale University and the University of California at Los Angeles. Although assisted by a common funding source, these centers vary in many important ways, reflecting different philosophies regarding the

essence of training in this area, the past experiences and managerial styles of their Directors, the administrative character of their host institutions, and even their geographic locations with respect to the state in which they reside and their propinquity to Washington, D.C.

Two of the programs are not funded as Centers but incorporated into academic curricula, undergraduate (Education) or graduate (Psychology), as designated tracks or areas of concentration. Finally, there is the description of a year long "immersion" program that integrates postdoctoral individuals of varying degrees of seniority into the legislative process at a federal level, thus providing first-hand experiential learning about the domain of policy. Again, it is important to note that the various programs described share many elements and differ largely in terms of the degree to which a given element is stressed. All programs, for example, attend to the importance of some sort of field or internship (externship) experience, with this element happening to be the primary, almost sole, thrust of the Congressional Science Fellowship program in Child Development and Social Policy.

As noted earlier, although the several programs described are highly individual and differ from one another in important ways, many also share some common elements and goals. Notice the frequent reliance on a core seminar of some sort. This may take the form of a proseminar with topics that change as a function of the expertise of a given guest speaker, an issue relevant to children or families currently in the limelight, or the interests of a given cohort of trainees. The seminar may also have a common thread, such as the communication of a particular skill (e.g., policy analysis), or the orientation of trainees, perhaps to the training program or to the "real world" of policy and politics.

Programs almost invariably provide some direct contact between students or fellows and persons active in the policy arena, frequently legislators, their aides, or appointed officials and those in government staff roles. There is probably no program in existence that does not recognize the importance of this aspect of the training experience, though different programs accomplish this purpose in various different ways.

Direct contact with individuals active in the policy arena is, of course, an inherent part of internship or other immersion experiences such as the Congressional Science Fellowship program, which further attests to the importance attached to providing contact between those in the training programs and individuals in the "real world." It is important to note how frequently programs embedded in academic institutions attempt to provide, and often require, at least some sort of *in situ* experience in a direct policy context. The difficulties in arranging this are many and are perhaps not always clearly spelled out in the present program descriptions. They include the necessity for contacts and perhaps even paths of influence between the program and individuals in the policy community, or the solution of timing and logistic problems that may be encountered when inserting a full-time commitment into a trainee's schedule already crowded with continuing responsibilities and externally imposed (e.g., academic) timetables and schedules. The geographic location of a training program adds another potential limitation or possibly a focus (e.g., state vs. national policy) in terms of the most feasible internship placements for trainees.

A somewhat surprising characteristic shared by many programs is the degree to which faculty involvement is often solely of a voluntary nature. For programs that are included as part of a

degree, of course, faculty time may be considered to be compensated as part of the base salary. But the success of several of these programs contains a hidden testament to the commitment many individuals in the discipline have for attempting the integration of child development research and social policy in that their effort and involvement is not directly purchased. With no intimation intended that such commitment is flagging, it seems clear that programs of training of this sort should not--and cannot--be expected to continue to exist or to flourish without such modest levels of incentives or recompense.

Many of the descriptions that follow provide some tracking of a program's evolution over the first several years of its existence. This should probably not be interpreted as predictive of the evolutionary course that any program will go through, though there are probably some common elements that are likely to be experienced. Accounts of evolutionary change should be taken more to illustrate the accommodations of programs to their host institutions, the trial and error learning from their own early experiences with faculty and trainees, and the development of thinking and practice in this area of training since these programs have generally been implemented during the very formative years of interest and efforts to provide training linking child development and social policy.

Questions

There are some hard questions that must eventually be asked about the future of training in Child Development and Social Policy. These questions are neither challenges to nor criticisms of current programs. Rather, they are simply issues that must be dealt with if there is to be a sustained recognition that the boundary between science and society is permeable and should be permeated, and if there is to be a positive evolution in the opportunities for training at this interface for the particular sciences that focus on child development.

For example, must there be some sort of internship/externship component in a program to impact direct knowledge of the policy process through an in vivo experience? Most, or perhaps all, would say yes, but this question still merits some penetrating discussion to determine what the trade-offs are for training that omits this component.

If an individual chooses to explore the interface between child development and social policy in a cursory but not totally superficial fashion--as in a minor concentration--is the hands-on experience expendable and, as noted above, at what cost? How necessary is a total immersion experience, such as the year-long Congressional Science Fellowship? What is the trade-off for a shorter experience? Are there other alternatives, such as a 2-3 week internship (or, perhaps better residency) that more senior individuals might pursue with a particular policy-relevant issue as a focus? At the time of this writing, efforts are under way to sustain a series of Summer Institutes coordinated by the Society for Research in Child Development and funded by grants. These institutes provide time-limited, in-depth concentration on child development and social policy for students and child development professionals (they are not as yet targeting individuals outside of the academy). The institutes are hosted by academic institutions and led by visiting faculty already expert in child development and social policy and by individuals from the "real world" of social policy (e.g., current and former legislators, appointed officials).

In short, by examining and dissecting the importance of the internship experience, one may consider the alternatives and how they might be insufficient in some instances but sufficient in others. Indeed, there most be instances in which they might be preferred: for example, a senior scientist seeking to become literate with the policy process may not have the time nor need the understanding that precipitates from the times during a Congressional Science Fellowship when the fellow, acting as legislative aide, must attend to issues of disarmament, protecting the environment, or foreign relations. Participation in these sorts of activities add depth to one's comprehension of the political/legislative process in general, but a grasp of this range and depth of the policy process need not be acquired by all who wish to intersect to domains of science, in this case child development research and policy.

Another question in serious need of attention is the proper role--in science/academia and in society--for the individual who has actually completed some training in child development and social policy. This question, of course, should be plural: what are the proper roles for such individuals and what are the personpower needs for individuals who could assume each role. What, for example, is the demand in the academy for young or more senior professors with expertise in child development and social policy? At this point in time, it is sufficient to be gratifying. But, hopefully, ours is a growth industry and it will increase.

Nevertheless, what are the other roles--in state or federal government, foundations, belt-way consulting firms, career legislative staff positions, or even politics--that are appropriately filled by persons trained in child development and social policy and ones that those of us in the academy would hope to train people for? Which roles are closer and which are farther away from the basic philosophic goals for training of this sort--or is such a question perhaps too pejorative and closed-minded to justify being asked when the values of those in the academy are so frequently constrained?

Conclusion

Each of the following "chapters" presents a narrative description of a particular training program, prepared by individuals responsible for the administration of the program and familiar with its origin, history, and philosophy, as well as its day to day operation. Each program has its own clear identity, even those with common sources of funding and similar missions. However, despite the diversity among the programs, those describing each were provided with a common outline that was intended to alert them to aspects of the program likely to be of interest to others.

This was done because the assemblage of these descriptions was intended to do more than encapsulate selected programs of training in child development and social policy as they happened to exist at this point in time. In addition to this purpose of historical record, the intent was also to provide examples of how such programs can be designed, what the constituent elements tend to be, and how programs with similar goals may be implemented differently to conform to the character of host institutions, the type of individuals trained, or the type of training stressed. In short, these descriptions of programs extant at this point in time may provide models for those wishing to develop new training programs in this area and needing to adapt such programs to new and different administrative homes, faculty, or other implementors and trainees.

Though a general outline guided the preparation of program descriptions, slavish conformity to the form of the outline was not insisted upon in order to allow the flexibility needed to capture the character and purpose of each program. The outline is presented in Table 1. It was intended to focus attention on those aspects of a program and its history that were felt to be central in capturing its mechanisms as well as its origins and philosophy.

First, some treatment of the creation of the program was suggested, including attention to issues of funding that always dog training innovations of this sort. In the relatively detailed description of each program that was, of course, the focus of each description, the person preparing the description was urged to attend to both general and philosophical issues as well as nitty-gritty elements that comprised the training as implemented.

General issues included the degree to which the program was interdisciplinary, the character of faculty participation, and the emphasis given to training in formal techniques of policy analysis. In the delineation of curricular elements of the program, attention was drawn to both coursework and tutorial aspects of the didactic component and to internship/externship opportunities as well. Also relevant to understanding the didactic elements of any program was some picture of the individuals selected or admitted for training and this, too, was solicited.

Research plays a major role in any training associated with a science, and those interested in child development are particularly tenacious in their commitment to expanding our understanding of all aspects of development (cf., Maccoby, Kahn & Everett, 1983). Thus, those describing the programs were asked to give some attention to the role that research, particularly problem-oriented or policy-driven research, played in their particular program. A self-evaluation was encouraged that attended to strengths and accomplishments, future directions, and current or anticipated problems. And, finally, since no independently developed outline could be expected to touch upon all aspects important to such a variety of programs, commentary was invited on concerns that might have arisen in a given program or on elements of training and research not adequately represented in the descriptions up to that point.

This is what those charged with describing the various programs were faced with when initially attempting to collect their thoughts and design their descriptions, and from this point they developed their own individual narratives from their positions as individuals intimate with the internal workings of their own program of training in Child Development and Social Policy as they existed in the early to mid 1980's. Their accounts follow.

Table 1

CURRENT MODELS OF TRAINING AND RESEARCH IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY

I. A brief accounting of the creation of the research/training program, including dynamics within the university as well as broader considerations (e.g., search for support outside the University). Questions of financial as well as philosophical support are relevant here.

II. Description of the program.

Some questions meriting attention:

A. Disciplinary roots? Interdisciplinary roots?

B. Faculty participation.

C. Role, if any, of formal policy analysis procedures. What model of policy analysis is adopted?

III. Elements of the training program.

A. Curriculum

1. Didactic program (including course or tutorial elements as well as core offerings).

2. Internship/Externship opportunities (required, available, extent used, etc.)

B. Profiles of Students/Fellows

1. Disciplines

2. Level (undergraduate, predoctoral, postdoctoral, mid-career)

IV. Research activities, their focus (state/federal/local, particular problems), and the role of research in the program.

V. Self-evaluation

A. Strengths and accomplishments

B. Areas of future development or improvement

C. Problems, if any, on the horizon (e.g., continued funding).

VI. Commentary

Free discussion of important concerns and elements not touched upon above.

References

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1983). Developmental research, public policy, and the ecology of childhood. Child Development, 45, 1-5.

Maccoby, E., Kahn, A., & Everett, 8. (1983). The role of psychological research in the formation of policies affecting children. American Psychologist, 38, 80-84.

Masters, J.C. (1984). Models for training and research in child development and social policy. In G. Whitehurst (Ed.), Annals of Child Development, (Vol. 1). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Phillips, D.A. (1983). Improving the connections between child development and social policy. Paper prepared for the Conference on Training and Research in Child Development and Social Policy, Vanderbilt University, March 18, 1983.

THE BUSH CENTER IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY

Yale University

Sharon Lynn Kagan, Elizabeth Schreiber, and Edward Zigler

Creation of the Program

The Bush Center at Yale University was established in 1977 with funds from the Bush Foundation of St. Paul, Minnesota. In early 1977, the Bush Foundation convened a panel of experts in the field of child development to determine how Foundation funds could be used to address the myriad of problems that beset children and their families in the United States. The panel, Urie Bronfenbrenner, Julius Richmond, Sheldon White, and Edward Zigler, recommended the establishment of a training program in the combined fields of child development and social policy. The purpose of such a venture would be to hasten the formation of social policies that were grounded in child development knowledge. If policy makers and researchers were in communication, then constructive policies might be developed using the latest research knowledge. Conversely, child development researchers would work to supply knowledge that had implications for social policy decisions.

Building upon the work of the panel, Dr. Zigler, Sterling Professor of Psychology at Yale and first Director of the former Office for Child Development, delineated three functions of such a training program:

1. The training of a cadre of inter-disciplinary scholars who would be equipped to work at the intersect of child development and social policy. This group would be trained in conventional methods of knowledge gathering in the social science field and would be sensitive to and cognizant of the social policy implications of research.

2. The development of research that had explicit ideas and guidelines for solving social problems.

3. The production of materials that would inform the American public about the nature and intensity of the problems facing children and families. The work and research of the center would be made available to the American public at large not just the scholarly community.

A proposal from Yale was submitted to the Bush Foundation in 1977. In the original proposal Dr. Zigler conceptualized the center and designed the basic program as a resource center and forum for the "community of scholars" involved at the intersect of child development and social policy. The proposal envisioned that individuals from diverse disciplines would meet to apply social science knowledge to social policy formation. This "community of scholars" concept would involve bringing together recognized individuals in the fields of child development and social policy, research associates and assistants, journalists, pre- and post-doctoral students, and support staff.

At Yale, under the direction of Dr. Zigler, a group of scholars already were in the midst of research studies in child development that possessed implications for social policy decisions. Funds were specifically sought from Bush to provide: (1) stipends for pre-doctoral and post-doctoral students; (2) seed money to fund the research activities and training of these students; (3) salary funds for one journalist and an assistant to work on public education efforts; and (4) funds for general secretarial support services. The Bush Foundation supported the proposal for five years, 1977-1978 through 1981-1982 and thus Yale's Bush Center was established.

The original panel envisaged not only the existence of a single center, but hoped that the Bush Foundation would support a national network of four university based centers. The Yale proposal provisioned for the development of a network of centers that would speak forcefully and knowledgeably on social policy issues impacting children and families. In 1978 Bush centers were established at the University of California at Los Angeles, the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

The Bush Network was established in 1979 and has subsequently been coordinated by the Yale Bush Center. While each Center is unique and operates independently, the network structure coordinates certain aspects of the training and public education efforts and facilitates communication among the Centers.

Program Description

Yale's Bush Center serves as a resource Center and focal point within Yale University for individuals interested in child development and social policy; it is not an academic department. Faculty hold appointments, and students pursue degrees, in Yale University departments. Individuals at Yale become affiliated with the Center--students become "fellows"--if they hold an interest and commitment to using their social science knowledge for social policy purposes. Each year, applications are also received from individuals not affiliated with Yale who wish to become post-doctoral or mid-career fellows at the Center. Two such fellowships are awarded annually.

Yale's Bush Center has evolved to become increasingly interdisciplinary in nature and simultaneously larger in number of affiliates. The number of fellows has grown from 14 in 1977 to 55 in 1985. A similar increase has been evidenced in the growth of the Center's faculty, from 9 in 1977 to 32 in 1985. Initially, students and faculty emanated primarily from the psychology department.

Based on recommendations from the Bush Foundation Evaluation Team and the Center's self-evaluation, diversification to include other disciplines became a recognizable goal. Simultaneously, individuals from other departments became aware of and interested in the unique endeavors of Yale's Bush Center. Gradually, the Bush Center has become a magnet for individuals interested in child and family policy, irrespective of discipline. Currently, Bush Center faculty and fellows hold primary affiliations with the psychology, sociology, and history departments, the Child Study Center, the Schools of Epidemiology and Public Health, Law, Organization and Management, the School of Medicine, and the Institute for Social and Policy Studies.

Not only have the faculty and fellows brought diversification to the Center, the Center has provided a forum to foster interdisciplinary endeavors in the establishment of two Units: The Unit on History and Social Policy was established to provide an historical perspective to the study of social policy. This unit sponsors colloquia and guides fellows' research which integrates history with social science fields. Through their involvement with the Unit Head, David Musto, and Assistant Head, Catherine Ross, fellows develop an understanding of the nuances that lead to the current state of child and family. The Public Education and the Media Unit, under the leadership of Susan Muenchow, provides training so that fellows will be able to convert their scholarly work into popular format. Concurrently, this unit publicizes the work of the Center through written, radio, and television outlets. Members of the press are invited to all Bush activities. Bush fellows are aware of the impact the media has on shaping public attitudes and policies through direct contact with media representatives and participation in workshops sponsored by the media section.

As noted above, the faculty of the Bush Center currently include 32 individuals who guide the work of the fellows, and help shape the Center. Faculty are called upon to present at Bush activities or to participate in Center planning.

Elements of the Program

Curriculum

Training Programs Components. As a resource center, the Yale Bush Center does not propose a single course of study or planned program. Instead the Center offers a variety of activities: luncheons, colloquia, workshops, seminars, internships, policy courses, scholarly studies, and Network activities. In conjunction with the Director and Associate Director, each Bush fellow develops an individual plan of study using the resources of the Bush Center, the University, and the community. Because of the diversity of students' disciplines, each fellow participates in a combination of activities and studies appropriate to his or her increase and future plans.

The planned activities of the Center are the seminars, social policy luncheons, the colloquia, and courses. These forums provide a range of perspectives, focusing on developing an understanding of the formation of social policy. A seminar entitled "Tutorial in Developmental Psychology: Social Action Programs and the Child," describes the relationship between social policy and developmental psychology through concrete illustrations. Center faculty draw upon their research and policy experience to examine the history, development, and effects of policies related to child and family life. As a semester requirement, each participant writes a policy-

related paper on the topic of his or her choice. Papers take the form of legislative histories, state-of-the-art studies, or policy analyses.

Each Friday at noontime, social policy luncheons provide a forum where current social policy issues are discussed. The luncheons bring fellows and the public into contact with academics, policy analysts, and political figures. Through these luncheons fellows learn about the process and effects of social policy construction. The luncheon speakers reflect the current interests of the group since speakers are invited at the suggestion of faculty and fellows at the Center. Colloquia and workshops are designed to address critical topics of interest in the field and provide an opportunity for in-depth dialogue and debate among fellows, faculty, and visiting scholars. Past topics have included a three part workshop on the translation of social science research into popular literary forms; colloquia on the history of divorce; and a five-part series on the construction of social policy. Because there are a number of outstanding policy courses offered at Yale, fellows are guided to capitalize on course offerings from the departments of political science, history and the Schools of Law, Medicine, and Organization and Management. The luncheons and colloquia are open to the Yale community at large while seminars and courses are available to fellows at the Center and students at Yale.

The Yale Center strongly urges its fellows to work directly in the field with policy makers. Internship opportunities exist on the local, state, and national level in service organizations, governmental agencies, foundations, and professional organizations. Students have interned at the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, and the Congressional Budget Office in Washington, D.C.; the Connecticut Department of Child Welfare; the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation; and many other agencies. The Bush Center has established a network of contacts to facilitate placements. In recent years, agencies have contacted the Bush Center hoping to procure fellows for summer work. While policy internship placement is handled on an individual basis, nearly all fellows participate in an internship during their affiliation with the Bush Center.

Fellows also participate in national conferences, and in conferences and impact groups sponsored by the Bush Network. Conferences included Child Abuse, Black Families and the Medium of Television, Child Health Policy, Common School in a Multi-cultural Society, and a Family Support Conference. Yale Bush fellows visit Washington each year and participate in gathering of Bush colleagues prior to national conferences.

Students. The Yale Bush Center offers fellowships to individuals at the pre-doctoral and mid-career levels. Thirty-five pre-doctoral fellows represent the disciplines of psychology, law, sociology, history, medicine, and public health. While pre-doctoral fellows are able to integrate their Bush training and their primary course of study simultaneously, post-doctoral and mid-career fellows come with a slightly different agenda. These individuals have previously received degrees and come to the Bush Center to specifically acquire social policy skills and knowledge. Currently the Center has fifteen post-doctoral and four mid-career fellows. The intellectual vitality of the Center is enriched through the experience and perspectives post-doctoral and mid-career fellows bring from the government and private sector. Post-doctoral and mid-career fellows come from the larger community outside of Yale. At the time of this writing affiliated mid-career fellows include a journalist from The New York Times, an urban school principal, and a

social service agency director. These fellows seek to acquire social policy knowledge in order to have more of an understanding of policy with the goal of improving services or training at their institutions.

The breadth of knowledge and experience the fellows bring the Center fulfills the original concept of a "community of scholars." The community is active intellectually as discussions and debates ensue at all luncheons, colloquia, and seminar gatherings. The community is active outside the Center as they pursue research studies, work in the field as interns or consultants, and prepare articles and speeches for popular audiences.

Research Activities

The research work of the fellows and the Center depends on the expertise and current interests of the faculty and fellows. Children's health and welfare, day care, and maternal infant policies are currently receiving emphasis. The Bush Center frames research questions, so that findings will be meaningful for policy makers. Findings are often translated into policy recommendations and publications.

Five years ago, the Bush Center began offering financial support for policy-related research studies and books. Currently there are 121 research studies and 7 books, that have been completed, or are nearing completion. Books include:

Project Head Start: A Legacy of the War on Poverty
Child Abuse: An Agenda for Action
Intellectual and Personality Characteristics of Children: Social Class and Ethnic Group Differences
Imitation: A Developmental Perspective
Day Care: Scientific and Social Policy Issues
Children, Families and Government: Perspectives on American Social Policy, and
Family Support Programs: The State of the Art.

Many of the research studies are collaborative efforts, drawing together the skills and knowledge of Bush faculty and fellows and experts in the appropriate field from around the country. These projects can be categorized as follows: Education and School Practices; Support Programs for Children and Families; Impact of Family Organization and Member Characteristics on Families; Health/Mental Health/Child Abuse; Governmental, Judicial, and Institutional Policies and Practices; and Typical and Atypical Development. These studies represent the Center's commitment to the development of scientific training coupled with the production of thoughtful social policy based upon careful research and solid evidence.

Self-Evaluation

Begun as a small enterprise, Yale's Bush Center in Child Development and Social Policy is now highly visible within the University and on the national scene. Utilized by the Yale community and by policy makers at both the state and national level, the Center has evolved into a multi-disciplinary resource center for child and family issues. On campus, the Bush Center has been one mechanism through which increased interdepartmental collaborations have taken place. The Bush Center has brought faculty together to address and act on critical issues that directly impact family life. Currently, an interdisciplinary team is working on the development of a national maternity leave policy. At the state and national

level, the Bush Center has been a resource for legislators and agency heads, providing research, policy analyses, and consultative services. Center members have also assisted the executive branch of government. At the request of President Carter, Bush affiliates, in conjunction with other experts in the field, prepared an analysis of the Head Start Program on the 15th Year Anniversary. This report helped chart the direction that Head Start was to take in the future.

The Bush Center's work has brought attention and visibility to the program and the interest of prospective fellows has increased, with applications increasing each year. Those who are trained at Bush have a variety of employment options upon completion of their training. Of these graduates, seven have accepted key policy positions in federal, state and local agencies. Eleven have elected to combine their research and policy interests and have selected positions in public and private non-governmental agencies. Twenty-seven graduates are currently college or university faculty members enriching their teaching with a policy perspective. Seven graduates have elected to continue study in policy related disciplines. Routinely, Yale's Bush Center is contacted by major universities and federal agencies seeking Bush graduates as potential employees.

The existence of the Bush Center has been catalytic in bringing funds into the University as well. The Administration for Children, Youth and Families has funded additional fellowships for minority fellows. Subsequently another grant was received from the government to support the identification and dissemination of information regarding family support programs. A portion of this funding will be used to sponsor a national conference at Yale in the spring, bringing leading scholars and policy-makers into the community. Funds from another source, the Annenberg Foundation, enabled Bush to sponsor a national conference on child abuse. Recently, another grant for further policy study in the area of Infant Care Leaves has been received, and the Pitway Corporation Charitable Foundation has provided financial support that has enriched the public education efforts. Each of these financial commitments is important, not only because it allows the Bush Center to extend its work into a critical area, but because funding from non-Bush sources demonstrably reaffirms the value of the Bush enterprise.

Future Development. Each year the Bush Center conducts a formal self-evaluation soliciting input from those involved in the Center. Modifications are made each year based upon recommendations. Presently, the Yale Center is focusing on maintaining a strong training program, and impacting policy while institutionalizing the Center at Yale. Because Bush Foundation support will terminate, the Director, Associate Director, and faculty are exploring alternatives that will sustain the Center at Yale.

Perhaps the most exciting aspect of the Bush Centers is that their establishment has created a new field. Prior to the existence of the Bush Centers, child development and social policy were regarded as two disjointed fields. Now, five years later, a unified, recognized, field exists, with employment opportunities, professional organizations, and university departments independent of Bush across the country. The Bush Centers have initiated a new era in informed social policy decisions. As the field of child development and social policy grows, the impact of a trained, knowledgeable cadre of professionals upon the policies affecting child and family life will be felt by all nationwide.

THE BUSH PROGRAM IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY

The University of Michigan

Judith C. Meyers and Harold W. Stevenson

Creation of the Program

The Bush Program in Child Development and Social Policy at the University of Michigan was established in 1978 with funds from The Bush Foundation of St. Paul, Minnesota. In early 1977, The Bush Foundation convened a panel of experts in the field of child development to determine how funds could be used to address problems of children and families in the United States. The panel, which included Urie Bronfenbrenner, Julius Richmond, Sheldon White, and Edward Zigler, recommended the establishment of training programs in the combined fields of child development and social policy with the aim of improving links between child development research and social policy construction. Training programs were to be developed at major universities. In addition, provision was made for developing a network in which the individual programs would join together in common activities such as conferences and topic-centered interest groups.

After discussion with members of the staff at The Bush Foundation, Harold Stevenson, Professor of Psychology at The University of Michigan, submitted a proposal for establishment of such a training program at Michigan. The original aims of the program as outlined by Dr. Stevenson were as follows:

1. Expand and improve existing training for graduate and post-doctoral students in areas relevant to child development and social policy.

2. Provide a forum where interested staff and students from many fields could come together to discuss issues relevant to child development and social policy.

3. Focus resources at The University of Michigan on important policy issues dealing with children and families.

4. Contribute to a better resolution of policy issues by providing scholars and practitioners a mechanism to proceed in a more thoughtful manner than often occurs in the policy world.

Training would be provided for professionals in the field of social policy and for pre- and post-doctoral students in child development. Professionals familiar with issues related to policy formation would be expected to increase their knowledge of child development through courses and involvement in research. Pre- and post-doctoral students specializing in disciplines related to child development would be provided more extensive coursework and practical experience in the development of social policy through the study of political science, economics, social history, and public administration. Internship experiences would be arranged in public or private agencies where development and application of policies for children and families occur.

The Bush Foundation provided funds to The University of Michigan for five years, 1978-1983. As described elsewhere in this monograph, programs were also funded at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), The University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), and Yale University. A grant was awarded to The University of Michigan in 1983 to support the continuation of the program.

The Bush Program at Michigan is located administratively in the College of Literature, Science and the Arts and is responsible directly to the Dean of the College. The program is housed in the Department of Psychology. The department is divided into areas, and the program is most closely associated with the area of developmental psychology, sharing physical space and other resources. Other institutes and centers at the university are available to serve as resources to the work of the Bush Program. The Center for Human Growth and Development, the Institute for Social Research (ISR), and the Institute for Public Policy Studies (IPPS), all are involved in work relevant to the concerns of the Bush Program. Through the years, additional schools and departments within the University such as the Schools of Law, Public Health, Education, and Social Work, and the Departments of History, Economics, and Sociology, have provided valuable resources to the Bush fellows.

Description of the Program

The core of Bush faculty through the years has come primarily form the area of developmental psychology. In addition, faculty from community psychology, sociology, social work, and education have been directly involved. With the exception of the position of associate director, funded wholly through the Bush Foundation grant, faculty members have not received compensation for their participation in the program. However, such perquisites as funds to attend conferences and clerical assistance have been made available. Beginning in 1982, however, several faculty members were awarded funds to direct a policy-related project involving the fellows. The projects were selected competitively by a committee of Bush fellows and faculty.

The program as initially conceived involved many activities. The structure included a core seminar, and a visiting lecturers program. The core seminar was to be organized around one or two specific topics each year. At the end of the academic year, a state or regional conference for researchers, service providers,

legislators, and consumers would be held. Such a conference would give a focus to the work of the seminar, increase the impact of the Bush Program, and provide a tangible product as an outgrowth of the year's work. The visiting lecturers program would involve five speakers throughout the year, with each speaker spending several days on campus, participating in the seminar and meeting informally with the faculty and fellows. Each of the topics covered in the seminar would involve a review of the research literature, consideration of how research might be designed to be of greater use to policy-makers, discussion of current social policies and practices at local, regional and federal levels, and consideration of the basis for initiating, continuing, or changing policies. Trainees in the program would be recruited from within the University for pre-doctoral fellowships. Post-doctoral fellows would be recruited nationally. An interdisciplinary mix of fellows from psychology, sociology, education, history, economics, journalism, pediatrics, public health, child psychiatry, and law, with an emphasis on strong representation of minority fellows was envisioned. Fellows would be supported with stipends for two years with full tuition paid during the first year. They would be required to participate in the seminar and speaker series. In addition they would do an internship and write a position paper, defined as a critical summary of existing evidence related to a specific issue, with conclusions and recommendations.

Over the past five years the program has evolved, and modifications have been made as different ideas emerged and were tried. During the first year (1978-1979), the program was implemented as initially proposed, with a core seminar and a series of visiting lecturers. There were ten pre-doctoral and two postdoctoral fellows. Thirteen faculty were affiliated with the program. The first term of the seminar focused on national issues. The second term centered more on issues in Michigan. In addition, many fellows enrolled in a seminar on "Legislation and Enactment of Social Welfare Policy," taught by Wilbur Cohen, former Secretary of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Required internships were taken either full time during the summer or part time throughout the year at such diverse sites as the Michigan Department of Social Services, the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), Office of Congressman John Conyers, and the Western Law League for the Handicapped.

During the second year of the program (1979-1980), the seminar focused on two topics related to family support systems: child care during the first semester, and health care during the second semester. Many of the Bush Network activities, involving all four of the Bush Programs, began during that year and Michigan played a major role. The first Network Interest Group was hosted by Michigan. The topic was "State Coordination of Education and Services for Handicapped Children 0-5." Representatives from the four programs met in Ann Arbor to plan a series of activities throughout a two-year period on that topic. The Bush Network conference, "Black Families and the Medium of Television," was held in Ann Arbor and was a tremendous success. The fellows visited Washington, D.C. for a three-day Bush Network orientation to federal policy-making. The Washington trip has continued to be a yearly event for all new Bush fellows. A series of colloquia was also held during the year, taking advantage of visitors to campus and local talent. There were twelve pre-doctoral and three postdoctoral fellows during the second year. Some of the internship sites were Michigan's Departments of Education, Social Services, and Mental Health, as well as the Health Care Finance Administration and NAEYC in Washington.

During the third year (1980-1981), the Bush core seminar and other activities centered on the theme of the relation of research in child development to practices and policies in education. The program sponsored a lecture series open to the university community with such speakers as Jerome Bruner, Seymour Sarason, and Patricia Graham. A three-week, jointly sponsored summer institute on "Learning and Motivation in the Classroom" was organized and sponsored by the Bush Program, the Sloan Program in Cognitive Science, and the Graduate School.

A book based on the "Black Families and the Medium of Television" conference was edited and published by the program. This was to be the first in a proposed series of publications, however, the endeavor proved to be a financial loss. Through this experience, it was learned that the program did not have the resources to carry out its own publishing efforts successfully. Other publishers are now sought. For example, a book derived from the summer institute was published by Erlbaum in 1983.

During the fourth year (1981-1982), perhaps in response to an exhausting prior year, greater concentration was placed on the use of local resources. The seminar focused on six topics rather than one theme, including relevant issues in law, television, migrant education, work, and family life. Internship sites continued to be varied and interesting, including UNESCO, The Foundation for Child Development, and the Burroughs Corporation's Office for Human Resources. To complement the Washington, D.C. conference, a day in Lansing was added to provide an orientation to policy-making at the state level. This has continued as a yearly event.

Some major changes in the organization of the program were put into effect for the fifth year (1982-1983). In place of the core seminar and the required internships and position papers, three work groups were organized around selected topics and each fellow was asked to join one of the groups. The groups were directed to produce a concrete, useful product, such as a conference, monograph, or presentation to an appropriate audience. The three groups were: Children and Law, which focused on such issues as child custody, child abuse and neglect; Children and Television, where the goal was to write a booklet summarizing the National Institute of Mental Health's recently published report on television and behavior and disseminate it to relevant members of the television industry; and Children, Families, Poverty, and Work, which organized a conference in Ann Arbor, drawing national participation.

The program's format was changed during the fifth year for several reasons. It was the consensus of program participants that the position papers were not a valuable learning experience. Fellows viewed the paper as one more academic requirement with no direct application. Second, both fellows and faculty believed that a project with a tangible outcome would provide a better learning experience. This proved to be the case. The work groups were successful in creating a broad interdisciplinary involvement, drawing faculty members from the Departments of Communications, Political Science, and Psychiatry, as well as the Law School and The Institute for Social Research. In addition to the work groups, weekly meetings were held to discuss the relationship of research to policy for the first year fellows. Although internships were no longer a required component of the program, all fellows continued to avail themselves of the opportunity and found it to be one of the highlights of their fellowship experience.

During the year this description was prepared, the program's sixth year (1983-1984), the work group model has continued. The Children and Television group was active for a second year. Plans included completing the pamphlet and producing a videotape on cognitive development in children that would be pertinent to producers of children's television. The product, however, did not reach completion, due to loss of some of the critical group members. Two new groups have been formed. The first involved a seminar on the impact of poverty, welfare, and female-headed households on children, taught by a political scientist from ISR. This seminar was followed by one during the second semester on the impact of unemployment. The Fellows reviewed the literature in these areas and wrote briefing papers, one of which was submitted as supporting testimony for a Congressional Hearing on the Impact of Unemployment on Children held by the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families. The third group for 1983-1984 is on "Chronic Illness in Children: Policies and Practice." It culminated in a Bush Network Conference on this topic held at Michigan in September 1984. Topics for the work groups were selected through a competitive process. Financial support for the faculty was initiated to address the problem of sustaining faculty involvement in the program when no compensation was offered. On a campus with so many competing demands and options, dependence upon people's willingness to participate voluntarily is not an effective means of sustaining cooperation over a long period of time.

The Bush Seminar was reinstated during that year. It now meets bi-weekly and focuses on the dimensions of the policy-making process at the federal, state, and local levels. A series of brown bag luncheon speakers, mostly from within the University, is also a part of the program. There were also several colloquia held, with experts invited to Ann Arbor to speak on a variety of topics. Sheldon Danziger, Director of the Institute for Poverty at the University of Wisconsin spoke about the impact of Reaganomics on children and families. Jane Knitzer, psychologist, spoke about the public policy for severely emotionally disturbed children. Jane Dustan, with the Foundation for Child Development, spoke about the work of the Foundation and its role in policy formation. The one Fellow who took an internship during this year worked in the Washington office of Senator Riegle.

Expanding on the work group model, the program for 1984-85 was built around a central theme: education research and policy. The majority of the year's activities were built around this topic. The four work groups each examined some aspect of educational policy. The topics are: (a) computers and children; (b) competency-based testing; (c) equity issues related to the study of math and science at the secondary school level; and (d) programs for pre-school children at risk. The year began with an invited conference examining each of these topics. Prominent researchers and education policy-makers attended. The conference laid the groundwork for continued interaction with state policy-makers in Michigan, which has had some mutually beneficial results. The Fellows have had numerous opportunities to meet with staff in Lansing, and develop their work group products with the state policy-makers in mind. One of the Fellows has arranged an internship with the Associate Superintendent for Public Instruction. Two smaller working conferences have been held this year: one to address issues in performance differences in learning mathematics in elementary school children, and a parallel conference on reading. These conferences brought about a dozen research experts to campus to discuss together the state-of-the-art in these areas. Using a central theme for the year has been a successful idea. It unifies the activities and has synergistic effect for both the Faculty and Fellows, as each of the

activities builds on the others. It is planned to continue this model in future years, with the theme of children's mental health having been designated as the next year's focus.

In summary, a review of the program's development over the past five years shows an evolution toward relying more on local resources and less on "big names" from Washington, D.C., and other universities. A format requiring experiental learning through in-depth exploration of topics replaced the exposure that occurs through a lecture series and the discussion of many topics during a single year. A group model centered on the production of relevant products replaced individual work such as that required in writing a position paper, and was accompanied by a move away from a fragmented and broad-based coverage of a large number of topics to a year long examination of one policy area as the vehicle for learning.

Fellows

During the Bush Program's seven years, there have been 41 pre-doctoral and 10 post-doctoral fellows, with a range of 8-12 pre-doctoral and 1-3 post-doctoral students each year. Until recently, pre-doctoral fellows have received full support during their first year in the program, including tuition and stipend, and approximately a 25% stipend without tuition during the second year. That has been changed since in-state tuition no longer applies if students work as research or teaching assistants. It thus became a more efficient use of the program's resources not to pay tuition, allowing the number of fellows accepted each year to be doubled. This has not been a hindrance in attracting applicants to this program, and as many as 18 fellows will be supported in future years. Fellows now negotiate their stipend based on the amount of time they commit to the program, with a minimum of $4,000 for a quarter-time involvement over two semesters and a maximum of $12,000 for half time through an entire year.

Six of the current pre-doctoral fellows have been admitted as affiliate fellows. They participate in all aspects of the program and benefit from travel money and staff assistance but receive no stipend. Typically, affiliates have received other university fellowships and have not called upon the Bush Program for their primary support. Post-doctoral fellows receive stipends based on the schedule for the National Institutes of Health, with the stipend being dependent on the number of years since completion of the Ph.D. Pre-doctoral fellows have entered the program during their 2nd, 3rd, and 4th year of graduate school and usually have remained involved in the activities of the program throughout their stay at the University, beyond their two years of receiving fellowship support. Thus there are typically five or more "advanced fellows" involved in any one year in addition to the group that is being funded. At the time of this writing, for instance, there is a group of 20 pre- and post-doctoral students who are actively involved in the program in one capacity or another.

While in the Bush Program, fellows continue a primary affiliation with their departments or schools. Involvement in the program is seen as an addition to their regular doctoral program, rather than being a doctoral program itself. Postdoctoral fellows, on the other hand, have a primary affiliation with the Bush Program. Although they may seek out projects and resources in other parts of the University community, the Bush Program serves as their home base.

Bush fellows come from a range of backgrounds. Minority fellows have comprised 28% of the total. Fellows have been

predominantly female, with males comprising 27% of the total. The range of disciplines represented has not been as wide as originally anticipated. Nineteen of the pre-doctoral fellows (46%) have come from within the Department of Psychology. A majority of these fellows (15) are enrolled in the doctoral program in developmental psychology. Others have come from the Combined Program in Education and Psychology, the Joint Program in Social Work and Social Science, and the Schools of Law, Education, and Public Health.

Of the ten post-doctoral fellows, three have been midcareer fellows, people who have been working for a number of years prior to their fellowship year. Two were with the Department of Education in Lansing, and one was a psychologist with the Ann Arbor School District, heading up programs for preprimary children. The others have been recent graduates of doctoral programs in developmental and social psychology, sociology of education, and law.

At the time of this writing, it is still too early to evaluate the program by examining where Bush graduates have gone after completing the program. Twenty of the program's 41 pre-doctoral fellows to date are still graduate students who are current 1st year, 2nd year, or advanced Bush fellows. Of the remaining 21, three left graduate school before completion, two transferred elsewhere, and four are still enrolled but are working full time elsewhere while finishing their dissertations. Of the twelve who have graduated, eight are employed in academic teaching and/or research positions, and three are in applied policy positions (the U.S. Congress Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families; the Society for Research on Child Development (SRCD) Washington Liaison Office; and the Chicago Urban League) and one who just finished is not yet employed. Three graduates of the program have been Congressional Science Fellows sponsored by SRCD, spending a year as legislative assistants in the U.S. Congress.

Research Activities

Direct support of research is not one of the program's purposes, but the program is involved with research-related activities in several ways:

1. Didactic discussion of the role of research in the policy-making process.

2. Reviewers of research relevant to particular topics of interest.

3. Methods of communicating search results to decision-makers through briefing papers, pamphlets, video tapes, and committee testimony.

4. Conferences on selected topics bringing together researchers, policy-makers, and practitioners.

In addition, during their internships, some of the fellows have been involved in ongoing research projects and occasionally have completed projects of their own (e.g., a needs assessment for home day-care for the Michigan Department of Education). None of the fellows has conducted a dissertation on a topic dealing with the social policy process, but this is something that it is hoped will occur in the future.

Self-Evaluation

A major strength of the Michigan program has been the quality of its fellows and the solid representation of minorities. Because of the involvement of minority fellows, there has been a continuing concern about issues relevant to minority populations. In the pool of applicants for the next year, however, none were received from minorities. This suggests more active recruitment may have to occur than has been the case previously.

The breadth of resources available at the University is another great strength. There are people interested and involved in issues relating to child development and social policy throughout the campus. The program is working to strengthen a network of interested faculty and other professionals both within the University and in local and state government offices and advocacy organizations. In addition to expanding the faculty involvement from other disciplines, it would be gratifying to see fellows themselves come from a broader range of disciplines. The Institute of Public Policy Studies, the Medical School (especially the Departments of Pediatrics and Psychiatry), the School of Public Health, and the Department of Communications have been underrepresented. Attempts are being made to increase the program's exposure in these departments and build effective links through jointly sponsored programs and courses.

A disappointing aspect of the program has been the post-doctoral fellowship. The pool of applicants, in contrast to that for the pre-doctoral program, is relatively small and typically not as high in quality. The post-doctoral and professional fellows have often found it difficult to structure a productive experience, integrating themselves into the University, and designing and carrying out a project within one to two years.

Another concern for the future is the question of how to best train students in the methods and theory of other disciplines relevant to public policy, such as economics and political science. Most fellows have very limited backgrounds in these areas. The program successfully sensitizes fellows to public policy through exposure and some experiential learning, but it does not adequately train them in the skills common to the policy arena. Cost-benefit analysis, evaluation research, policy analysis, as well as economic theory and political thought are all important to understanding the decision-making process related to public policy. To address this concern, a joint degree program has been created in which one could obtain a masters degree in public policy through the Institute for Public Policy Studies (IPPS). Our first student to enter that program will begin next Fall, obtaining a masters degree in public policy through The Institute for Public Policy Studies (IPPS) while a Bush fellow and a doctoral student in developmental psychology, through the addition of one year of course work.

Since the inception of the Bush program, there has been significant progress toward developing a meaningful training experience for those interested in integrating research with social policy in the field of child development. What was once uncharted territory is beginning to gain some clarity and coherence. The coming years will be ones for the development of further sophistication and improved techniques for training.

THE BUSH PROGRAM IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY

Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Ron Haskins and James J. Gallagher

Creation of the Program

Original Proposal for Funding. The UNC Bush program was originally stimulated by a request for proposal from the Bush Foundation of Saint Paul, Minnesota. James Gallagher and Ron Haskins organized a group of about 10 people from 8 departments on the UNC campus to discuss the contents of the training program, the specific features of a grant that might be submitted, and the interest of various individuals and departments on the UNC campus in participating in the training program. The grant was subsequently written, funded, and the program began in July of 1977.

Description of the Program and Elements of the Program

Training Program. The UNC Bush training program consists of several distinct activities. These are outlined in two sections below. The first section, frames on five activities that are primarily intended as means of training students and fellows; namely, the Core Seminar, the policy analysis paper, a course in child development and social policy, the faculty-fellow group analysis, and the Washington trip. In the second section, program activities are outlined that have purposes other than training, although they also serve a training function.

Core Seminar. Bush faculty and fellows meet in seminar each week during the academic year for approximately two and one-half hours. Seminar time is divided roughly into three equal parts. First, largely through the use of case studies, the Bush model of policy analysis (see below) is presented and illustrated. Second, there is an attempt to provide fellows with an overview of federal policy that affects children and families. Topics covered include: health policy, day care and preschool programs, education policy, nutrition programs, and income and child support policy. As a part of this section, two or three class periods are devoted to an

overview of the federal budget in historical perspective, with special attention to changes in spending on social programs, and to the Congressional Budget Process. Third, students and fellows make two presentations on their own policy analysis topics. In addition, occasionally there are guest speakers. Each year, for example, Paul Ginsberg from the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has been invited to describe the mission of CBO and to explain the federal budget process.

Policy analysis paper. Each student and fellow is required to conduct an analysis on some aspect of child and family policy. Typically, these projects follow a model adopted by the program, and are completed under the supervision of one or two faculty members.

Course in child development and social policy. All students and fellows are required to take a one-semester course in child development and social policy taught by a Bush faculty member. The course provides an overview of developmental psychology organized around the issues of nature-nurture, change and continuity, and intervention research. Throughout, an emphasis is placed on empirical studies and theory that bear implications for public policy, with particular attention to evaluation studies of intervention programs for preschool and school age children. A final section of the course is devoted to a consideration of the role of social science data in policy making.

Faculty-fellow group analysis. Whenever possible, teams of faculty and fellows are organized to conduct policy analyses of particular aspects of a general policy problem. In 1982-83, for example, the program planned a state conference on the theme "changing roles of women in North Carolina." As part of the planning, four faculty-student teams were organized to write background papers on the topics: women and the economy, changing family roles, female-headed families, and occupational safety. The work culminated in a state-wide conference of policymakers, practitioners, and academicians interested in women's issues. The policy analyses served as background reading for conference participants, and particular attention was devoted to consideration of the policy recommendations offered by each paper. Similar joint faculty-student analyses have been conducted on the topics of childhood injury and public education policy.

Washington trip. Each year, in conjunction with the other three Bush Centers (UCLA, Yale and Michigan), students and fellows in this program visit Washington, D.C. for two days of meetings. Typically they meet with analysts of other officials from the Congressional Budget Office, the Children's Defense Fund, the General Accounting Office, and the Congressional Research Service. In addition, the fellows have dinner with SRCD's Congressional Science Fellows and there is usually a panel discussion of child and family legislation currently pending in the Congress.

Other activities. In addition to the training activities discussed above, there are several other activities that provide valuable experiences for fellows, but which are not primarily designed as training activities.

First, there is typically a colloquium series each spring organized around some issue of child and family policy. One year, for example, six experts on health care were invited to visit UNC and present critiques of the Report of the Select Panel on the Promotion of Child Health. While on the UNC campus, each visitor met for about two hours with the students and fellows to discuss health policy.

Second, there are frequent media workshops which bring about 20 reporters, editors, and producers to North Carolina to discuss issues of social policy and the media. Groups of faculty and fellows make presentations on selected policy issues (e.g., mothers in prison, unemployment and children's health , child support), members of the media discuss problems they have with using social science information in their stories, and members of the media are given a chance to interview selected faculty members and fellows on their policy interests.

Profiles of Students/Fellows

Doctoral program. Two types of fellows participate in the UNC program. Doctoral students are admitted to the program at or near the end of coursework in their major discipline (usually in the fall of their third year of graduate work). They are then supported for two years while they take the two semester seminar on policy analysis and child and family policy as well as the course in child development and social policy, write the policy analysis, and complete their dissertation. In most cases, doctoral students select an analysis topic that is closely related to their dissertation topic. Thus, the two pieces of work complement each other, and at least one member of the Bush faculty participates on the student's doctoral committee.

In addition to completing Bush requirements, students also meet all degree requirements of their academic department. Thus far, doctoral students have been selected from 13 academic departments or units on the UNC campus: counseling education, special education, clinical psychology, social psychology, developmental psychology, political science, sociology, law, health administration, health education, maternal and child health, journalism, and economics.

Professional fellows program. Professional fellows are admitted to the program for one year of full-time work. They must be at least five years beyond their last degree (not necessarily the Ph.D.), and have substantial job experience in a field that directly or indirectly concerns children or families; e.g., teaching, social work, state level administration of human service programs, advocacy, etc. Professional fellows are required to take the Core Seminar and the course on child development and social policy, and to write a policy analysis. In addition, professional fellows take a major role in Institute activities, and often participate in planning and carrying out seminars, conferences, publications, and so on.

Faculty

Bush Faculty are drawn from a dozen or so academic departments and units at UNC. These include political science, sociology, psychology, social work, law, public health, and education, among others. Though faculty members receive no direct compensation for their participation, it is often possible to provide funds for minor research expenses, travel or in-kind assistance such as secretarial services. In addition, several faculty members have extended their research and policy interests through joint publication with Bush fellows, and an even larger number of faculty members have published their policy work in the program's series of edited books on policy analysis.

Policy Analysis Model

As mentioned above, about one-third of the Core Seminar time is devoted to discussion of analysis models. Further, fellows and students are encouraged to use a particular model in their policy analysis papers. The generic model most frequently used is one that requires a problem statement, a specification of analysis criteria (usually including equity, efficiency, stigma, and preference satisfaction), a description of alternative policies, and a synthesis of information applied to the selection of a particular policy. In addition, there is frequent use of an implementation model adapted to the analysis of extant policies. This model requires a statement of the policy problem, a description of the policy that was enacted to address the problem, a discussion of the value base for the policy, a description of how the policy was actually implemented, an examination of the barriers to implementation, and recommendations for action.

Interdisciplinary Nature of Program

When it is claimed that the UNC Bush program is interdisciplinary in nature, three things are meant. First, both students and faculty are selected from a variety of academic disciplines. As a result, discussions of policy problems in the Core Seminar reflect the perspective of several disciplines. Second, there is an attempt to emphasize, through presentations in the Core Seminar and in the required course on child development and social policy, the basic assumptions, methods, and knowledge of several academic disciplines--especially economics, public health, social work, and child development. Thus, there is an attempt to assist fellows in learning, if not how to think like a scholar from several disciplines, at least to understand how the various disciplines approach their subject matter. Third, students are more or less required to read and cite information from several disciplines in their policy analysis paper.

Research Activities

Students are not required to conduct research, though there are funds to support research if students wish to do so. Typically the research has been of the survey type, with a major objective of attempting to find out how or whether a particular program was implemented, by whom, and with what results. Thus, the research has been primarily descriptive.

Nor does the UNC program require research courses or offer overviews of materials, design, data analysis, and so on in the Core Seminar. It is assumed that doctoral students receive research training in their academic departments, and that professional fellows enter the program with research skills.

Self-Evaluation

Two major problems raised by training in analysis of social problems deserve brief attention. First, much of the research most directly applicable to social policy issues has been conducted by investigators from disciplines other than developmental psychology. There are two training problems created by this fact. First, the students must be induced to learn something about other social science disciplines, and second, they often lack familiarity with the research designs and statistical methods employed by investigators from other disciplines.

In a degree program in policy analysis, one could attend to these problems by requiring coursework in the assumptions, theories, and methods of research by other disciplines (especially psychology, economics, law, maternal and child health, pediatrics, sociology, and social work). However, in a program such as this, which doctoral students take as an add-on to their regular departmental requirements, and with professional fellows being in residence for only 11 months, extensive coursework has not seemed to be the answer. The solution, which has been less than satisfactory, is to admit students and fellows from several disciplines and to have faculty members from a variety of disciplines. Thus, discussions of policy issues in the Core Seminar often reflect the viewpoints, as well as the body of empirical studies, of several social science disciplines. Further, students usually involve three or four faculty members from different disciplines in their policy analysis work, and in this way obtain insights and references to pertinent studies from these disciplines.

A second problem faced by a program such as this stems from the fact that faculty members are not directly supported by the program budget. Rather, participating faculty members are regular members of academic departments that pay their salary and have the primary claim on their time. Thus, faculty members participate in the Bush program on a completely voluntary basis, and receive no compensation or release time through their academic department. Indeed, depending on the level of their commitment to the program, Bush involvement could interfere with their normal departmental responsibilities.

On the other hand, the program offers some incentives for faculty participation. First, several faculty members have been able to obtain support for superior graduate students through the Bush fellowship program. Second it has been possible to devote some funds to in-kind support of active faculty members; e.g., funds for travel to conferences, for computer time, for books and other materials, and so on. Finally, the program has offered an opportunity for several faculty members to be involved in professionally stimulating activities such as planning and presenting at national conferences, participating in the publication series, and meeting faculty and fellows from the other Bush centers.

On the whole, however, the question of maintaining faculty interest and time commitment is a major problem for any program dependent on voluntary participation. This is a chronic problem that requires constant attention by program staff.

Recently attention has been turned to the long-term fate of this training program in social policy analysis. In particular, what will happen when funds are no longer available from the Bush Foundation? Although there has been considerable support from academic departments and individual faculty members at UNC, this is not a propitious time to begin a new program supported by state funds. Thus, to a substantial degree, the continued existence of the Bush program after 1987 is likely to depend on an ability to attract outside funding in the near future.

THE BUSH FOUNDATION TRAINING PROGRAM IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL POLICY

University of California, Los Angeles

Thomas David

Creation of the Program

The UCLA Bush Program was established in 1978, concurrently with the programs at North Carolina and Michigan. The program's base in a Graduate School of Education was unique among the Bush Programs, as was the Co-Director structure. Until January 1982, the program had two Co-Directors--Norma Feshbach (Head of the Early Childhood Specialization in the Graduate School of Education) and John Goodlad (Dean of the Graduate School of Education). Dr. Goodlad then served as sole Director of the program until June 1983, when he appointed June Solnit Sale (Director of UCLA Child Care Services) Co-Director to serve with him through the conclusion of the Bush grant.

There is no degree program or research institute at UCLA which focuses on public policy, so the program assumed the task of organizing a network of faculty members who shared an interest in children's policy issues. From an initial strong identification with the Early Childhood faculty in Education, the program has each year broadened its scope and now enjoys truly multidisciplinary faculty participation. More than 40 UCLA faculty members are involved, representing most of the major professional schools (Architecture and Urban Planning, Education, Law, Management, Medicine, Nursing, Public Health and Social Welfare). While a "Center" has not been established as a concrete, physical entity, the program's reputation has grown across campus so that it now serves as a central resource for students, faculty and administrators on children's issues.

Another aspect of this program that distinguishes it from the other members of the Bush network is its location in a major Metropolitan area with an extremely diverse population. As the program's campus presence has solidified, increasing attention has

been devoted to establishing strong connections with local and state policy communities. Internships by Fellows in the program have been the primary vehicle for community contact, but the program has also incorporated a number of community experts on children's issues into an extended faculty. In addition, public education programs have been developed that are geared to the needs of local decision makers in both the public and private sectors. With this increased involvement has come a growing visibility as a university group that possesses not only specialized knowledge and technical expertise but a realistic appreciation of the policy world as well.

Description of the Program

Two general program objectives were articulated in the original grant: (1) to prepare individuals who can integrate child development research and social policy; and (2) to convey information to the general public on critical issues related to children. Through experience, both objectives have subsequently been redefined. Initially, the program attempted to serve the dual functions of developing in child development researchers a more sophisticated understanding of social policy while exposing individuals from policy-related backgrounds to insights and methods from child development. As the disciplinary base of the program broadened, the common denominator for Fellows became an interest in children and policy rather than "child development" per se. Accordingly, training activities now concentrate on the role of research in the policy making process and on exposing Fellows to historical precedents and current developments across a rather broad spectrum of child and family policy issues.

Public education efforts within the program have become much more targeted at decision makers rather than the general public. This was the result of a conscious decision to maximize impact at key points of leverage given rather limited staff and material resources. It has been successful. The program's Fellows and Faculty are frequently called upon to give advice to decision makers "behind the scenes." For example, a key piece of state child care legislation in 1984 was significantly shaped by a meeting between a legislative committee consultant and the program's child care study group.

Broad-based faculty participation is one of the special strengths of this program. The Fellows each select a faculty member to serve as a "Sponsor" for their projects. The Sponsors meet regularly with the Fellows throughout the year and provide them with content-specific guidance on strategies for information gathering and analysis. They also give the Fellows extensive feedback on their written work. In addition, more than ten faculty members participated in the development of the general program seminar last year, as formal instructors and as guest presenters on specialized topics.

Faculty members have always played a significant role in the governance of this program as well. The mechanisms for their involvement have been both formal and informal, but the current governance structure has proved quite successful. A faculty Steering Committee composed of seven members (representing five schools and departments) meets monthly with the Co-Directors and Associate Director to discuss program business. In addition, five faculty "study groups" have been formed that are organized around policy themes (child and family health; child care; child and family welfare; schooling; children and communications technologies). These meet regularly to share research in progress and to keep abreast of current policy developments in their field. Some Fellows

have also participated in the study groups with particularly beneficial results.

One of the benefits of multidisciplinary faculty involvement is exposure of Fellows to a stimulating variety of perspectives on policy analysis. The program espouses no single model of policy analysis. Rather, there is examination of the applicability of multiple models, from highly quantitative "rational" economic models to more personalistic approaches such as that articulated by Aaron Wildavsky. The methods employed by the Fellows in their projects reflect this continuum--from conventional cost-benefit analyses of aggregated data to case studies of individual programs that utilize qualitative, participant observation techniques.

Elements of the Training Program

There are three basic components of the training program: the seminar; the internship; and the individual research project. Each of these will be discussed in turn.

A weekly seminar in child development and social policy is offered as a graduate level course-for-credit in the Graduate School of Education, although up until this year enrollment was restricted to Bush Fellows. It is now open to all students, and a two-quarter course sequence has been formally adopted by the Education faculty as a permanent offering, beginning September 1984.

Since UCLA Bush Fellows are funded for one academic year only, the weekly seminar is a rather intensive, demanding experience. There is clearly more material than there is time to address. The content focuses on four areas: introduction to critical child and family policy issues (history and current initiatives); the policy making process (state and federal); policy-oriented research (models and issues in the role of "expert"); and skill development (written and oral communication; information gathering). The seminar is also used to expose Fellows to as many guests from the policy community as possible. Since the program is located 400 miles from the state capital, it would be almost impossible for Fellows to have close contact with legislative and agency staff people otherwise. Every attempt is made to have outside guests 4-5 times a quarter. All Fellows also attend a three-day orientation in Sacramento during the summer preceding their fellowship year when they have a chance to meet with legislators, agency staff and legislative advocates.

Internships are arranged both by the program and through the initiative of individual Fellows. Although some Fellows have interned in Sacramento and Washington, time and financial considerations cause most of them to select internships in the Los Angeles area. There are a wide variety of interesting placements available locally, as examples from this past year's Fellows attest: three worked in the local offices of state legislators; two were in the Los Angeles Superior Court (child advocacy office and conciliation court); one worked with a child care advisory committee in the Mayor's office; and three worked in service delivery settings.

A year-long internship is required of all Fellows, and it is considered to be an absolutely critical part of their experience in the program. However, due to school demands and simple economic pressures, the amount of time a Fellow spends in her placement can range from as much as two days a week for a post-doc to only four hours a week for a busy doctoral student. Although there have inevitably been some less-than-optimal experiences, most Fellows have felt the internship to be a valuable experience. An informal

survey would seem to indicate that the more time Fellows are able to devote to the internship, the more they feel they benefit from it. The program is working to increase the linkage between the seminar and the internship by incorporating more of the Fellows' field experiences and contacts into the classroom sessions.

The Fellows' individual research projects flow from their personal interests rather than a group agenda established by the program. The faculty sponsor and seminar faculty serve as primary consultants to the Fellows, although they are also encouraged to seek out off-campus sources for advice. Fellows are expected to develop a project that fills a "real world" information need of a policy organization. Therefore, they need to identify their "audience" early on in the process and consult that audience periodically throughout the development of their project.

A phased plan of "deliverables" throughout the year, with feedback built in at each step, was developed to help Fellows complete a project in the tight time constraints imposed by the program. The year culminates with a mock policy forum where the Fellows individually present their projects to an audience of invited guests, faculty and peers, who are instructed to role play a particular decision making group (e.g., a legislative committee or school board). The ground rules conform to those in the group being simulated, and the Fellows can count on a barrage of difficult questions from partisan members of the audience. These forums have become an annual tradition, and Fellows have been unanimous in their judgments that they are a tremendous learning experience.

Generally there have been 10 Fellows funded per year. In the past, individuals were considered to be Fellows only if they were full participants in all program activities (for which they received a full fellowship). This year some people are funded who can only undertake limited participation in the program or who are developing a special project of importance to the program. They are designated "Affiliates."

Fellows tend to come from a variety of disciplines. Last year's group, for example, included Anthropology, Education, Pediatrics, Psychology, Public Health and Social Welfare. In the past a mix of predoctoral (restricted to UCLA graduate students) and postdoctoral (recruited nationally). Fellows have been funded, at a ratio of 7:3. After receiving many inquiries over the years from midcareer individuals, formal recruitment in that category was initiated this year--with excellent applicants. From an initial, very positive, experience with a "walk on" midcareer Fellow last year, it is anticipated that two current midcareer Fellows will be an excellent addition to the program--and an invaluable resource for the other Fellows. Fellows tend to develop a strong group identity, and certainly one of the highlights of their Bush experience is the opportunity to learn from and work closely with one another.

Research Activities

The research projects undertaken by Fellows tend to focus on state and local issues; however, the questions they address frequently have national implications as well. For example, several Fellows in the past three years have investigated the local impact of federal budget cuts in such areas as child welfare services and the child care food program. The subject matter of individual projects ranges widely, from an overview of national policy dilemmas regarding single parent families to an analysis of the validity of a proposed instrument to measure program quality in state subsidized child care centers. The latter report was submitted directly to the

responsible state agency, which acknowledged its usefulness in subsequent revisions of the instrument.

At the center of all program activities is a concern for the role of research in the policy-making process. Although all of the Fellows enter the program with substantial research skills, a good deal of time and effort is devoted to an examination of the particular challenges and dilemmas of policy research. Guests from Sacramento are consulted about how research can be designed to better meet their needs, and the importance of communicating research results to decision makers in a language and format they can comprehend is continually emphasized to Fellows.

Faculty members are also engaged in policy-related research, and they serve as important role models for Fellows who anticipate an academic career that includes some active policy involvement. However, faculty-initiated research has remained separate for the most part from any direct identification with the program. As a "program" research grants have not been sought, nor have groups of faculty collaborated on particular projects under the program's aegis. An identity has been maintained (for better or worse) as a training program rather than a research center. This is a pattern targeted for change in the future.

Self-Evaluation

The UCLA Bush Program exemplifies a multidisciplinary, collaborative model of training--an approach that has required substantial experimentation to implement. Much has been learned along the way, and offerings will continue to be "fine tuned" each year in response to experience and developments in the policy community. There are four areas in which the program's success seems most clearly demonstrated:

-- the impressive group of faculty members who have committed themselves to work for the UCLA Bush Program. The number of faculty involved in the program has increased each year--a sign of real promise for the future of the program.

-- the development of an ongoing seminar on child development and social policy and other training activities. The increased emphasis on internships has been particularly effective in enhancing the program's visibility in the policy community. The program now regularly receives more requests for interns than it can begin to fill.

-- the ability to attract Fellows with a real commitment to policy. The number of applications received continues to grow each year. This year, more than 15 applications were received for each postdoctoral position funded.

-- the activities of program graduates to influence constructive social policies for children and families. About half of the graduates are employed by policy organizations in both the public and private sectors, while the other half hold university faculty positions (and incorporate policy content into their teaching).

Since the funding from the Bush Foundation for this program ended in June 1984, at the time of this writing continuation funding is being sought for the program. In that process, a shift in program priorities is beginning to be articulated, one that emphasizes collaborative faculty and student research to enhance the

quality of policy decision making for children in California. Training will continue to be a major part of the program, but it will take place in a more experiential context. Plans include the development of four to five "networks" of decision makers (in the areas of education, child welfare, child health and the juvenile court) and support for Fellows and faculty to engage in long-term problem solving and research with those networks. The majority of the Fellows' time will be spent in field placements, with regular on-campus seminars to help them integrate their experience and to expose them to special guests.

This evolving plan will directly address some of the drawbacks of the current model: not enough time for internships; one-year only funding for Fellows; and no compensation for faculty. Plans call for the funding of Fellows for full-time internships during summer breaks to complement their part-time school year involvement. It is hoped to increase their school year internship time to one day per week at minimum. Concurrently, there are plans to begin funding Fellows on a multi-year basis, with this program thus becoming a true "parallel" to their doctoral studies. There is also the need to provide more concrete incentives for faculty involvement. As the program's "networks" become established, it seems sure that the program will qualify for research and consulting contracts with client agencies--and generate a good percentage of its own financial support.

Perhaps the most dramatic change from the current program structure will be a shift from Fellow-determined research topics to projects that flow from the needs of client networks. Fellows will be recruited to work with specific organizations and/or on a specific research project. In most cases, Fellows will undoubtedly play a key role in shaping research agendas for their internship organizations, but the first priority as a program will be to respond to the information needs of decision makers. This is seen as a natural development in the program's evaluation from a classroom-oriented "training program" to a more broadly-based "Center for Child and Family Policy."

PROGRAM IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC POLICY

Department of Education
Mills College

Edna Mitchell

The public policy component of the child development major at Mills College enables the undergraduate student to focus attention on child/family issues which are affected by policy decisions at local, state and national levels. The undergraduate students work with graduate students on action-oriented projects of mutual interest.

The program is founded on the belief that an academic program in public policy analysis which ignores the realities of the political process leads students to cynicism and despair as well as to possible contempt of the process. The goal is to educate students who can be researchers, scholars, and practitioners; and who, at the same time, will be effective as communicators between policy makers and their public constituents.

Creation of the Program

The course work and activities within the program were stimulated by the SRCD Congressional Fellowship awarded the Head of the Department of Education at Mills. As a result of the experiences in Washington during the fellowship year, this focus was incorporated into the departmental curricula. No special funding was required or sought. Course work was reviewed and revised in the light of student interest, knowledge and skills considered essential, and resources available. The resources of the San Francisco Bay Area are especially appropriate to this program. They include a regional office for the Department of Human Services, one of four Foundation Centers established to assist in seeking foundation support for projects, research libraries of the University of California at Berkeley and Stanford University, as well as a variety of programs for delivering services to a diverse urban community.

Description of the Program

Public policy is a focus within child development and does not lead to a special certificate, credential, or degree with public policy in the label. While the impetus for the families and children aspect of the curriculum comes from the Department of Education at Mills, the program has interdisciplinary connections to the political science, sociology, and psychology departments. There is no outside funding for the program. It is integrated into a Master's program in child development.

Elements of the Training Program

Students design their own program in consultation with their adviser. The program includes a class in research methods and information, part of which is devoted to an introduction to the use of statistics in policy analysis. A course in public policy issues includes information about the operation of different policy-making bodies in the state and federal governments. In a course entitled "Administration of Programs for Children," students also learn procedures for needs assessment, identification of resources, and effective grassroots action for influencing policy decisions.

Students are expected to select an area for study and involvement during their senior year or the last two semesters of graduate work at the M.A. level. This may be working as an intern in an agency, or in an institution serving families such as a hospital, assisting a non-profit group in writing grant proposals or communicating their needs in a public forum, working with a legislator or a lobbying group, and other action-based experiences which sharpen their knowledge and skill in analyzing and influencing policy decisions.

Graduate students in child development at Mills each take a course or attend lectures on public policy, and faculty work with them intensively on skills and issues. Since concerns about children-youth-and families and public policy are very broad, one of the problems is assisting students in developing some sophisticated knowledge about many issues, but also helping them focus on a single issue in which they may develop authentic expertise.

The approach of the program at this level is more action-oriented than research oriented. Students are introduced to sources of data which they may use in obtaining information on topics. They are taught how to locate and use government documents and reports, how to evaluate sources, and how to follow through on indirect clues to additional information. For many this is the first introduction to the government process of committee hearings, committee reports, OTA analyses, and other sources of information which are used by policy makers and which shape policy decisions, but which are seldom accessible to the public.

For students who are advocacy oriented, the urge to "do something" about an obvious problem or injustice often overpowers the need to be sure of the facts and implication. This part of public policy work is glamorous: checking and weighing statistics, and evaluating options. Looking at long range implications of policy decisions is much harder. The program attempts to combine both the action and the academic analysis. A primary goal for this group, however, is responsible participation. Students must learn that they can enter the policy-making arena and can make a difference if they are persistent and well informed. They each select a primary project for a year, they share the progress on the project in seminars, and they provide team support for aspects of one another's special projects.

Students in the program meet state lobbyists on children's issues, must communicate with local and federal legislators, develop skills in networking on a particular issue with other professionals and citizen groups, and spend time searching the Foundation center materials as they develop skills in proposal writing directed toward action projects as well as research projects. They have a field experience requirement which enables them to choose among options including work in a legislator's office as a volunteer or intern,

work with a lobbying group or child advocacy organization, work in a federal or state agency on children's and family issues, or work with a research group on public policy issues.

In addition to courses and field experiences in the Department of Education, students are advised to take courses in government including Political Psychology, Political Analysis, and the Public Policy-making Process. They also are directed toward sociology classes such as Poverty and Public Policy.

The total credit for this focus is expected to be approximately 1/2 of the major. It will be a minimum of 15 semester hours, 5 courses at the undergraduate level and 4 at the graduate level, including the field practicum or project.

Research Activities

The role of research is important at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, although it is emphasized more rigorously at the Master's degree level. All studentns are directed toward analyses of issues through obtaining factual information, statistical data, reviewing trends and historical patterns, studying social values and beliefs, applying models which calculate costs of alternative actions. However, these students are also expected to demonstrate their ability to participate as responsible citizens in an arena in which they believe public policy needs clarification, implementation, or formulation.

The Children's Defense Fund Child Watch has been used as a model for action research in the Bay Area. One particular project is beginning to bear fruit. The students surveyed hospitals in the area, after discovering that many hospitalized children with chronic disease do not have a consistent educational program while in the hospital. Often, their education is ignored while they are at home between hospital visits. This is the responsibility of the local school district, but with budget reductions this is one program which is sorely neglected. Even when operating properly, only children who reside in the district are visited by a teacher. Many children come to Oakland Children's Hospital and U.C. Medical Center from other states and even other nations. After gathering data, and case histories on some of these children, and with the cooperation of the hospital administrators, students approached the school districts to discuss the problem with them. They ran into a brick wall at this point. However, an effort to disseminate information about the problem resulted in obtaining the interest of a local state legislator who now plans to introduce legislation to address the issue. The problem is a small one, but it is not limited to California and San Francisco. It is not a policy study on a large scale. However, it did provide a real opportunity for a group of graduate students to become actively engaged in several levels of policy issues. The realities of competition for limited resources, of looking at priorities objectively, documenting the problem in statistical as well as human terms, and following through with concerted action and public information activities was a valuable experience. It gave them a strong sense of how to use their academic knowledge in a practical way. It is a skill that is transferable to other issues.

Another example of action research involves the plight of children whose mothers are in prison. There is a Federal Prison for Women about 30 minutes from the college. Women in prison are often abandoned by their husbands, if they have them, and their families. They are often desperate about the care being provided their children. Many of these women are in prison far from their home

states. Often children are placed in foster care, or even adopted, and the mothers are not able to maintain contact. One nine year old child found a way to stow away on a flight from Florida to California in an effort to visit his mother. When the children do come to live near the mother in prison, their financial aid may be cut off. Aid distributed through counties is tightly controlled. Once a child moves, the counties, and states, refuse to take responsibility for his welfare. This is particularly difficult in situations where children need medical care, and each jurisdiction passes the buck to the other. Students began to study the literature, gather the statistics on this problem, scattered and hard to identify as they were, and began to work with a group called Prison Match which has recognized the problem for a few years. This problem has federal significance, although it is not a popular cause. This is an era when women in prison are not viewed with sympathy by a punitive public. Students and faculty have begun working with an attorney who represents prison parents, have talked with the mothers in prison, and have begun to build a coalition to carry the story of these mothers to legislators at the national level. The most concrete contribution has been to assist in writing a grant proposal for supporting a national network of Prison Match persons. Students assisted by identifying foundations which may be interested in such a project, and used their grant writing skills to assist in the development of the proposal.

The issue of Grandparents' Rights also has been of interest to students. The complex legal implications of federal legislations have provided an interesting topic of debate leading to an awareness of differences in State legislation which would require compromises. This issue has offered a central focus out of which has been spun a recognition of the need for knowledge about foster care, divorce laws relating to beyond the best interests of the child, and adoption laws as they affect the child's continuing contacts with the extended family of his birth.

Self-evaluation and Commentary

One of the biggest training problems has been focus and depth of expertise. It is difficult for a faculty member to be well informed about issues and trends on the many public policy problems facing us today. Another serious problem is the conflict between obtaining scientific objectivity and the urgent need for advocacy. Policy decisions are infrequently based on objective data. Knowing how legislators respond to personal and emotional persuasive illustrations, it seems important that professionals who care about public policy must also know and use the approaches that can effect change.

THE GRADUATE MINOR IN PSYCHOLOGY AND SOCIAL POLICY

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Deborah A. Phillips

The graduate minor in Psychology and Social Policy at the University of Illinois is designed to train students in the methodological, conceptual and substantive contributions that psychologists can make to the development of sound and effective social policy. The intent of the minor is not to produce experts in the substantive issues of any particular policy area, nor experts on the tools of any particular policy analysis method. Rather, it is intended to familiarize students with the central issues, methods and values that characterize policy deliberations across a broad spectrum of public and private policy-making settings. A major goal is to highlight the opportunities that psychologists and other social scientists encounter, as well as the constraints and dilemmas that they face, when they enter the policy-making arena.

Creation of the Program

In September 1980, a study group of psychology faculty spearheaded by Horton Weir was formed to discuss the feasibility of establishing, "within a broadly based scholarly framework, " a program in psychology and social policy. A widely-shared interest in applying research knowledge to the formulation and implementation of public policy provided the major impetus for the formation of this group. The policy program was conceived of as a systematic and high-quality endeavor aimed at strengthening the department's interface with the public policy domain, with training as a central component.

As an initial step, the study group disseminated a questionnaire to every faculty member aimed at assessing the faculty's interest in and capacity to implement a policy program. Information was obtained about current direct involvement in policy-relevant activities, professional activities with direct or indirect policy implications, and degree of interest in becoming more involved in activities relating to psychology and policy. The results of the poll indicated that the Department offered much in the way of both enthusiasm and expertise pertinent to the envisioned program. The Department already provided a generous range of courses that addressed policy issues, a sizable number of the faculty expressed an interest in expanding their involvement in policy-related matters, and these faculty members represented virtually all subareas within the department.

Based on these encouraging responses, the study group recommended that the Department offer a graduate minor in psychology and social policy. (Graduate students at Illinois are required to fulfill requirements for both a major and a minor area of study.) This recommendation was unanimously supported by the Department and

the minor in psychology and social policy received official approval at the close of the 1982 academic year.

Description of the Program

The policy minor is presently geared toward graduate students in all subareas of psychology, although both faculty and students from other departments in the University are encouraged to participate in the development of the program. Student participation in the program is voluntary (there is no independent selection process), although all students seeking to qualify for the graduate minor must complete the requirements described below. The emphasis of the minor is on graduate-level course work and direct experience in policy settings, although a variety of other activities (i.e., policy colloquia, research projects, cultivation of associations with state and local policy-makers) will complement the formal training program.

A small committee (five persons drawn from different subareas in the Department) oversees the minor in psychology and public policy. The responsibilities of the committee include preparing current descriptions of the minor for the information of students and faculty; keeping a current listing of courses that will satisfy the requirements of the minor; overseeing internship/practica placements; and calling occasional meetings of the larger group of faculty interested in policy matters.

The core faculty for the program are drawn primarily from developmental, clinical/community, social, and organizational psychology. In addition, a large number of other faculty in the Psychology Department have expressed an interest in contributing to the program, some of whom were teaching policy-relevant courses prior to the implementation of the minor, conducting research projects with explicit policy implications, or engaged in other activities (consulting, conferences, committees) that involved them in policy issues. In addition, three faculty members were recently hired largely because of their substantial interests in policy and capacity to guide the development of the policy minor. These faculty also bring first-hand experience in policy settings to the program. These experiences include full-time professional positions in federal agencies (i.e., Justice Department, Department of Health and Human Services), Congressional offices, and Congressional support arms (Congressional Budget Office); placements on Presidential commissions; and appointments to advisory panels and review boards that oversee policy-relevant research and training activities (i.e., National Academy of Sciences, American Association for the Advancement of Science). Several members of the faculty have also established on-going ties with the Illinois Department of Children and Youth Services, the local juvenile justice network, and social service divisions of the major hospitals in Urbana-Champaign.

Elements of the Training Program

Curriculum

Students qualifying for the policy minor are required to complete the following four components:

The Policy Program Seminar. The core substantive component of the program is a policy seminar entitled, Psychology in the Public Domain. The seminar deals with the role of social scientists in the development, implementation and assessment of social policy in various areas of the public and private sectors. It was offered for the first time in fall 1983.

The Evaluation Methods Component. The core methods component of the program is a seminar on program evaluation and policy analysis methods. It deals with conceptual, methodological, practical and ethical issues in the evaluation of social policies. It was first offered in spring 1984. No single "model of policy analysis" is adopted since the objectives of the policy minor encompass a broad range of activities and substantive areas for which various appraches to policy analysis are appropriate.

Policy Relevant Courses/Seminars. The policy minor requires at least one additional policy relevant course or seminar, selected from a list approved by the social policy program committee. The list of approved courses, which is kept current by the social policy committee, includes courses from other departments (e.g., social work, political science, education). The list comprises some courses that have policy issues as their major emphasis that always qualify; and others that qualify only when taught with a particular (policy) emphasis. Still other policy-relevant seminars are offered on a one-time only basis. For illustrative purposes, the following seminars and courses, offered in the psychology department during the 1982-83 academic year, represent the types that qualify: Community Psychology and Social Systems Change, Human Abilities, and seminars on Child Development and Social Policy, Mental Health Policy, Monitoring Children's Services, and Psychology and the Law: Conflicts, Disputes and Trials.

The Practical Experience Component. One key feature of the full minor in social policy is a practical experience requirement. The aim is to ensure that students have some "hands on" experience working in close proximity to the policy-making process or in some actual policy setting. The requirement can be fulfilled in a number of ways but must entail, at a minimum, the equivalent time commitment of a one-unit course for one semester. The crucial element is that the student be directly involved in the formulation, implementation, or evaluation of social policy. That could involve placement in any of a range of agencies or organizations (e.g., school board, social service agency, city government, citizens' action group, civil service commission, United Way Board); working with policymakers on a joint beneficial project (e.g., evaluating a special education program; developing criteria for jury selection; etc.), or taking a seminar that requires extensive out-of-classroom involvement in policy settings. In contrast, merely being in an "action agency," being involved in routine direct delivery of services, and/or conducting routine employee research in an organization does not fulfill the "policy experience" requirement. Students are encouraged to design their own policy experiences. All proposals for the practical experience component are subject to the approval of the social policy program committee. A relatively extensive experience is recommended for students who are considering policy work as a career option.

Profile of Students

The policy minor is presently available to graduate students only. Prior to the establishment of the formal minor, the students enrolled in policy-relevant seminars offered by the Psychology Department were disproportionately drawn from the developmental, clinical, and community psychology subareas. Results from a recent canvas of student interest in the policy minor were as follows:

24% of the students indicated they would seriously consider completing a policy minor

16% of the students indicated they would enroll in one of the core courses next year

22% of the students expressed an interest in taking a policy seminar or pursuing field work in a policy setting

24% of the students want to "pick and choose" from several components of the program, but felt unprepared to decide about the formal minor

27% of the students indicated they had no interest in the policy program.

Information has just begun to be gathered about the career decisions of the graduate students who have expressed an interest in social policy. It is thus somewhat premature to assess the policy program from this standpoint. Nevertheless, one initial indicator of success is that two students have been selected as SRCD/AAAS Congressional Science Fellows and another student was selected to join the Family Impact Seminar at Catholic University as a research assistant on their investigation of family indicators and service use.

Research Activities

Students in the program are consistently involved in policy-relevant activities that include research. Some examples will illustrate this aspect of the program.

Child Watch. Graduate students in the policy program conducted a Child Watch Project in collaboration with the local chapter of the Junior League. The project was developed as a graduate seminar. Child Watch is a monitoring project that examines local programs providing services in the areas of child health, child welfare, and family income assistance, and child welfare. The objective of the project is to assess and publicize how local service delivery has been affected by recent social service policy and funding decisions at the federal level. Using a lengthy interview form they developed and piloted, the students gathered interview data from program administrators, city government officials, child advocates, service providers, voluntary and charitable organizations, and families. They then compiled the information, wrote a report of the findings, and distributed it widely through-out the Champaign-Urbana area. Students were also responsible for a "public education" component of Child Watch which exposed them to the media and to numerous local organizations. The final stage of the project consisted of individual activities geared toward collaborating with local agencies to develop means of ameliorating an identified problem, or working closely with the media to flush out issues through the press.

Dissemination Project: Minimum Competency Testing. In 1980, the Illinois Board of Education formulated general guidelines for the development of minimal competency tests (MCT). These guidelines allowed much local discretion in adopting a very controversial educational policy. Teachers and local school administrators expressed great interest in receiving unbiased, clear, research-based information to guide their decisions. A team of graduate students met weekly to develop a pamphlet which translated research findings on types of MCT, validity, and test preparation into a brief, readable format. The pamphlet was disseminated to 1,500 teachers as part of a field test. The results of the field test were used to revise the pamphlet which was subsequently disseminated to every school district in Illinois.

Judicial Procedures. Policy students have been involved in several projects sponsored by the federal courts. These include an evaluation of psycholinguistic features of criminal jury instructions, a study of the effects of several procedures for challenging and excusing jurors in civil cases, and an evaluation of a mediation program in a federal appeals court. A project currently in the planning stage will involve policy students in an evaluation of a new court-annexed arbitration program in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

Research on the Work-Family Interface. This research is concerned with evaluating the effects of alternative workplace policies on the quality of work/nonwork life. Women nurses have constituted the principal subject population in preliminary studies. Issues that are being investigated include: the status of women in the workforce, with a special emphasis on occupations that have historically been dominated by women; organizational design and its relation to the quality of care provided by human service delivery systems; the effects of work stress on the nonwork health and well-being of employees; and the success of dual worker family lifestyles.

Self-Evaluation

Strengths and Accomplishments

The greatest strength of the Graduate Minor in Psychology and Social Policy, during this fledgling stage in its development, has been its broad base of support within the University and the Psychology Department. It is highly unusual for a traditional academic program to be so hospitable towards a relatively foreign endeavor. It is particularly beneficial that the program has been conceptualized as extending to all of the subdisciplines within psychology. This has attracted many more faculty and students to make an investment in the program. It has also facilitated receptivity on behalf of faculty and administrators outside of psychology. Several examples of recent accomplishments demonstrate this point:

Springfield Science Seminars. The Department of Psychology, through the Social Policy Program, has taken the lead in initiating a series of legislative seminars in the Illinois state capital. The impetus for the seminars arose out of a growing concern with the paucity of direct communication between the research community at the University and the State Legislature. The central purpose of the seminars is to serve as a catalyst for the development of informal networks among the Liberal Arts and Sciences faculty, legislative staff, and state agency staff around specific shared issues (e.g., economic development, criminal justice, math and science education). The first seminar, held in 1983, addressed the topic "Math and Science Education: Working Toward New Solutions." Three faculty from the Mathematics, Chemistry and Education Departments presented their perspectives on this topic before an audience of 20 members of the Illinois General Assembly. Seminars in 1984 addressed the problems of Literacy and Biomedical Research.

Undergraduate course titled "Social Science and Policy-making". During the summer of 1983, Professor Deborah Phillips received support to develop an undergraduate course in the area of social science and social policy. The course was intended to offer some initial preparation to those undergraduates who were interested in pursuing the policy implications of the broad range of topics that encompass "social science." Three broad sections of the course were

to be devoted to an overview of the social policy process, the interface between science and policy, and the particular roles and vehicles available to social scientists who were interested in applying their work to policy issues. Because social policy is an inherently interdisciplinary subject, guest speakers were to be employed to provide concrete illustrations of the general themes of the courses in a variety of scientific disciplines such as education, sociology, and psychology.

Select Conference on Public Policy. The Psychology Department was represented on a six-member University Advisory Committee for the University of Illinois 1984 Select Conference on Public Policy. The theme of this conference was, "The Impact of the Information Revolution on Public Policy."

Areas of Future Development

In addition to the further development of the Science Seminars and policy course offerings within the Psychology Department, the following activities are planned:

Policy Speaker Series. A proposal has been presented to the Psychology Department to initiate a public policy speaker series. One important purpose of this series would be to lend greater saliency to the new policy program for faculty and students in the Psychology Department and other departments within the University. In addition, it would play a critical role in educating the research community about the breadth of interesting issues that comprise the area of psychology and policy, and in demonstrating that scholarship and policy are compatible. In the meantime, several eminent policy experts have been included among the list of speakers for the Psychology Department colloquia series.

Internship Placements. Over the next year, a major task of the Social Policy Program Committee will involve compiling a directory of internship placements. These placements will be designed to serve a variety of student interests and needs. For example, choices may range from summer internships in Washington, D.C. to one-day-a-week placements with the local United Way to ongoing consultation with a major corporation concerned about personnel policies.

Problems

This is not a particularly opportune time to be initiating a major program in light of the financial status of universities and competition for external support for education and social science. Available funds will necessarily determine the scope of the Policy Minor. Nevertheless, it has been encouraging to discover how far a shoestring budget can be stretched.

An additional potential problem arises from the extent to which the responsibility for implementing the program has rested with untenured faculty members. For a career in which security comes with tenure, it is difficult for junior faculty to devote extended amounts of time to policy work and program development.

Commentary

It is difficult to capture the goals of a training program by merely describing its structure and participants. Equally as important as the curriculum, practical policy experiences, and research opportunities, is the general orientation towards training which is implicit in the design of a program. Any program of the

sort described here is most generally geared toward enabling students to make career choices. Students seek policy training for distinctly different aspirations, e.g., preparation for a policy career, exposure to issues, seeking new applications for research. This requires tremendous flexibility by program faculty. In addition to instilling a foundation of knowledge and skills pertinent to policy concerns, it is important to provide students with an appreciation of the personal qualities that are likely to enhance an individual's enjoyment and effectiveness in the policy arena (e.g., a sense of humor, tolerance for role confusion, quick-wittedness, inventiveness, and a talent for persuasion). It is also essential to offer students a realistic set of expectations about the science-policy interface -- expectations about the limits of what can be accomplished, the diverse range of players in the policy process, and the inevitable conflicts between scientific and policy purposes. Thus, the real challenge in developing a policy program lies in transmitting these amorphous and complex features of the policy process that are not readily translatable into a graduate curriculum.

By way of example, consider the policy courses offered by one faculty member. They consistently include exposure to the information sources, the dilemmas and constraints, and the major modes of information-gathering and presentation that characterize policy work. Every class is introduced to the government documents collection. Every student is required to write a 2-page briefing memo using government sources, phone calls to Congressional and agency staff, and press documents. The memo then serves as a starting point for a debate aimed at persuading me to take a position on the issues addressed in the memo. Readings are assigned from the Congressional Record, Congressional Budget Office and National Academy of Science reports, Census publications, and Congressional Research Service issue briefs. The intent, in part, is to instill knowledge and then to take the next step and encourage students to use it in ways that approximate the tasks of a scientist working in a policy setting. These are only two examples of the numerous ways in which this approach could be applied.

It is also important to acknowledge that faculty are not necessarily training students to be "like them." The traditional mentor role is not necessarily well suited to our relationships with students who do not aspire to careers as academic psychologists. For some faculty, training students to be conversant with social policy issues may be less rewarding as a consequence. For others, it may provide an opportunity to explore new ground. In all cases, our role involves acknowledging what we cannot teach and providing alternative educational opportunities -- the broker role.

Finally, a single program is not equipped to train full blown policy experts. This requires years of experience and multiple teachers. Rather, it is suited to provide a foundation and to encourage students to put their own mark upon it.

THE CONGRESSIONAL SCIENCE FELLOWSHIPS IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Program Administered by the
Social Policy Committee
of the
Society for Research in Child Development
through the
Washington Liaison Office

Barbara A. Everett and Lindsay Chase-Lansdale

The Congressional Science Fellowships Program in Child Development is an experience-based training program sponsored by the Society for Research in Child Development. Fellows come to the program from backgrounds in research and serve as special legislative assistants on Congressional staffs for one year. Through their direct experience they are expected to gain an understanding of the federal policy process, and, to a lesser extent, to become knowledgeable about specific federal programs.

Creation of the Program

Initially, the Congressional Science Fellowship in Child Development Program was administered by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which founded the Congressional Science and Engineering Fellows Program in 1971. The goals of the program are (1) to make practical contributions to the more effective use of scientific knowledge in Congress; (2) to educate the scientific community about the development of public policy; and (3) to create a more effective liaison between science and Congress. Approximately 40 Fellows, sponsored by a number of scientific societies, currently participate in the Congressional Science and Engineering Fellows Program.

Funding for the Congressional Science Fellowships in Child Development has been provided by the Foundation for Child Development and the William T. Grant Foundation. The first four Congressional Science Fellows in Child Development were selected in 1978 by a committee constituted by the AAAS. They, along with other AAAS Congressional Science and Engineering Fellows, participated in an orientation program, were counselled about their placement alternatives, and attended monthly seminars. All of these activities were administered by the AAAS. Prior to the beginning of the 1979-80 fellowship year, representatives of the foundations asked the Governing Council of the Society for Research in Child Development, through its Committee on Child Development and Social Policy, to assume responsibility for the selection of the Fellows. The Society constituted a special committee for this purpose, and the second contingent of four Fellows was so selected in 1979. In 1980, the Foundation for Child Development, which had been supporting one Fellow each year, increased its support to three Fellows. Since 1980, funds for the Congressional Science Fellowships in Child Development have been awarded to the Society

for Research in Child Development, and the Society currently sponsors six Fellows each year through its participation in the Congressional Science and Engineering Fellows Program.

Description of the Program

Subsequent to their selection by a committee of the Society, the 1979-80 Fellows participated in orientation, placement and seminar activities arranged by the AAAS, as had their predecessors. The Society has gradually assumed increasing responsibility for portions of each of these activities.

Beginning with the 1981-82 fellowship year, SRCD's Washington Liaison Office assumed a more active role in the orientation and placement of the Fellows. The increased involvement was endorsed by the Committee on Child Development and Social Policy, in recognition of the emphasis on the physical sciences in the AAAS orientation and placement program. In 1981, Washington Liaison Office staff worked with the AAAS to ensure that more events of specific import to the Congressional Science Fellows in Child Development were included in the orientation program. Currently, the Washington Liaison Office plans three to four days of the orientation program, which lasts for two-and-one-half weeks.

Since 1981, the Fellows have also met with one another, the Washington Liaison Office staff, and former Congressional Science Fellows in Child Development at a dinner meeting on the day preceding the beginning of the AAAS orientation. Currently, Liaison Office staff meet with the new Fellows prior to the beginning of the orientation and with the new Fellows and former Congressional Science Fellows in Child Development at the conclusion of the orientation. These sessions provide an opportunity for the Fellows to talk with Liaison Office staff and the former Fellows about placement alternatives that offer the greatest potential for working on issues related to child development concerns.

In addition to the contact they have with SRCD's Washington Liaison Office during the selection, orientation and placement phases of the program, Fellows also meet individually and collectively with the staff. Initially, these meetings were scheduled to maintain contact between the Fellows and Liaison Office staff; to keep staff informed about what the Fellows were doing; and to provide an opportunity for the Fellows to talk about any problems they were encountering. In 1981-82, the meetings became more focused when the Fellows met with Liaison Office staff to plan the program for a Convocation of Fellows, supported by the Foundation for Child Development, and to prepare a presentation for the Southeastern Conference on Human Development. Since 1982, when the Washington Liaison Office relocated to Capitol Hill, Fellows and staff have been meeting on a monthly basis to exchange information and talk about their respective activities, to plan presentations for professional meetings, and to reflect on the role of the fellowship program in relation to the field of Child Development and Social Policy.

The portion of the orientation conducted by the Washington Liaison Office, the pre- and post-orientation placement meetings, the SRCD Seminar Series, and the Fellows' monthly meetings with Washington Liaison Office staff are elements of the program that have evolved gradually over a five-year period. The Congressional Science Fellows in Child Development continue to participate in orientation, placement and continuing education activities conducted by the AAAS, but these are supplemented by activities developed by the Society for Research in Child Development through its Committee

on Child Development and Social Policy and implemented by the Society's Washington Liaison Office. As important as these activities are, they are auxiliary to the core element of the program, which is the day-to-day experiences Fellows have in their Congressional offices.

Elements of the Training Program

Curriculum

There is no standard curriculum for the Congressional Science Fellowships in Child Development Program, except what is represented within the orientation, the placement process, the SRCD Seminar Series and the Fellows' meetings with Liaison Office staff.

The overall orientation program is designed to benefit all the Congressional Science and Engineering Fellows, the majority of whom come from the physical sciences and engineering. The program provides a broad, comprehensive exposure to the federal policymaking community. Fellows attend presentations on Congressional process, the federal budget, agency procedures, and interest group activities and meet with Members of Congress and Congressional staff, federal agency personnel, interest group representatives and former AAAS Congressional Science and Engineering Fellows. The sessions arranged by the Washington Liaison Office provide exposure to Congressional staff, agency personnel and interest group representatives concerned with the social and behavioral sciences and with federal programs that provide services to children and youth.

The core element in the curriculum for the Congressional Science Fellows in Child Development Program is the experience the Fellows have while serving as special legislative assistants in Congressional offices. After they complete the orientation process, Fellows have from two to three weeks to secure a Congressional placement. During this phase of the program, Fellows operate independently, visiting a number of Congressional offices and talking with Congressional staff to determine the placement that seems most suitable for them. From the time they decide which office they will join, the Fellows' activities are determined primarily by the arrangements they made with Congressional staff prior to choosing their placements, issues that arise during the course of the year and become foci for the office, and the extent to which office staff entrust major responsibilities to them. Although there are common elements in this aspect of the training, there is also considerable individual variation.

Fellows may be given broad responsibilities and treated like a regular member of the staff. They may, for example, be responsible for all staff work related to the reauthorization of a particular program. Such an assignment could include gathering background information, meeting with interest groups, preparing floor statements, developing questions for witnesses at hearings, writing speeches, attending Congressional committee meetings, making legislative recommendations, and drafting legislation. Alternatively, Fellows may be given more limited responsibilities. They may be assigned specified portions of the staff work related to a general category of programs, for example, which might include following legislation pertaining to children and families and communicating with constituents about child and family issues. All Fellows learn Congressional processes as a consequence of their office experience. The extent to which they become knowledgeable about the nuances of the process or familiar with the substance of specific programs varies according to their individual assignments.

Profiles of Fellows

From the inception of the Child Development Fellowships, efforts have been made to ensure that Fellows represent a range of scientific disciplines. The fellowship is advertised in the publications of a number of disciplines, and the membership of the selection committee is multidisciplinary. To date, Congressional Science Fellows in Child Development have come from the research arms of the disciplines of anthropology, education, law, nursing, psychology, public health, social work, sociology, and urban planning.

The doctorate is required for the fellowship, and mid-career individuals are especially encouraged to apply. Of the 38 individuals who have participated in the program, 17 have been mid-career Fellows and held secure academic positions to which they could return. Eleven Fellows have been new Ph.D.s; of these, four were mid-career in that they had worked for a number of years prior to receiving the doctorate. Ten Fellows have come from other post-doctoral training programs.

The Role of Research in the Program

Since the fellowship program is for research scientists, and since the purpose of the program is to give research scientists experience in social policy, one of the criteria for selection is that Fellows have had rigorous academic training and research experience prior to entering the program. Fellows are not expected to engage in empirical research during the fellowship year, which affords little time for such pursuits, but rather constitutes an immersion into the policy side of the research/policy interface. The "research" Fellows do engage in consists of collecting and analyzing background information and making recommendations for legislation, activities that could be considered broadly analogous to the literature review phase of an empirical study. Fellows are expected to identify potential areas for future research in the course of their experience and to become knowledgeable about procedures for bringing research into the policymaking process.

Self-evaluation

Strengths and accomplishments

The strengths and accomplishments of the Congressional Science Fellowships in Child Development Program can best be evaluated in relation to the goals of the program. The first goal is "to make practical contributions to the more effective use of scientific knowledge in Congress." By the end of this year, thirty-eight Fellows will have completed the program. Each will have contributed to the achievement of practicality and effectiveness in the course of his or her daily activities during the fellowship year. By assuming the role of Congressional staff members, Fellows learn not only what information relevant to child development concerns is needed in Congress, but also how to frame scientific information into the policymaking process so that it will be maximally "effective." Fellows learn how to synthesize the essential findings of a scientific study bearing on a policy issue, for example, so that the information stands a much greater chance of being read and understood by Members of Congress and their staffs than it would if they read it directly in the form in which it was published in a scientific journal.

A few Fellows have continued to work for their Congressional offices on a part-time basis after the fellowship year. The majority of Fellows have maintained contact with the Congressional office in which they worked and also begun to communicate about child development issues with their own Representatives and Senators. Fellows have also incorporated what they have learned about practicality and effectiveness into their teaching and research and have communicated about what they have learned through professional speaking and writing and through informal dialogues with scientific colleagues.

The second goal of the fellowship program is "to educate the scientific community about the development of public policy." During the fellowship year, the Fellows are the members of the scientific community who are being educated. They also address this goal by making presentations at SRCD meetings and the meetings of other scientific societies and by writing about their experience in the SRCD Newsletter and the publications of other scientific and professional organizations.

At the time of this writing, thirteen of the 31 Fellows who have completed the program have returned or gone on to academic positions. These individuals continue to address the "education" goal through their teaching and research, in addition to the activities described above. Eighteen Fellows have assumed positions that involve them more directly with the policy side of the research/policy interface. Some continue to work toward the fuller integration of research and policy through professional organizations such as SRCD, the American Education Research Association, and the American Psychological Association. Others work for charitable and private sector organizations such as the National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse and the United Way of America, and their concerns are more focused on the programmatic implications of research and policy. Six former Fellows work on Congressional staffs, one as a legislative assistant and policy analyst on American education issues, three for the House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families, one on the House Committee on Education and Labor, and one on Senate personal staff. These individuals also continue to pursue the "education" goal of the fellowship program through their speaking and writing activities, and they are simultaneously engaged in educating policy makers and practitioners and expanding opportunities for scientific knowledge to enter the policymaking process.

The third, and overarching, goal of the fellowship program is "to create a more effective liaison between science and Congress." Within the context of this goal, the great strength of the program is its grounding in experience. Learning about the federal policy process by serving as a member of a Congressional staff is not unlike learning about a foreign culture by living in it for a year. The contrast with learning about either in the classroom or from books is broadly equivalent. Through their Congressional placements, Fellows learn about the mechanics of the policy process and acquire knowledge of programmatic issues. These are necessary, but not sufficient, conditions for achieving the goal of effective liaison.

Scientists and policy makers have not been allies traditionally. Trust and mutual cooperation between them have been inhibited by stereotypic assumptions and a lack of understanding of the other side's "rules of the game." Scientists seldom run for Congressional office, and it is rare for a scientist to become a member of a Congressional staff. It was recognition of the relative

dearth of scientists in Congress that led the AAAS to establish the Congressional Science and Engineering Fellows Program.

The presence of science fellows on Congressional staffs does much to dispel stereotypes. Through their personal interactions with Fellows, Members of Congress and their staffs learn that scientists can deal with practical concerns as well as abstract theories, and they gain an appreciation of the breadth and diversity of the scientific literature on policy-relevant questions and for the scientific approach to issues. Fellows learn that policymakers can be concerned and committed as well as political, and they acquire respect for the Congressional "subculture" and a realistic appreciation of the numerous factors that influence the development of public policy. These are outcomes of the fellowship program that derive from its experiential focus and that are clearly critical to the achievement of "effective liaison."

Problems

The Congressional Science Fellowships in Child Development Program currently faces a problem similar to that confronting other research and training programs in Child Development and Social Policy, namely, the problem of continued funding. At the time of this writing, the program is assured of support the 1986-87 fellowship year, and the current grants providing funds are not renewable. An immediate problem, therefore, is to decide whether to try to continue the program in its present form, i.e., as a part of the AAAS Congressional Science and Engineering Fellows Program, and seek alternative sources of support, or to develop a different approach to achieving the same or related goals. The long-term challenge is to devise ways to continue to contribute to the growth and development of the fledgling field of Child Development and Social Policy through approaches that build on the past accomplishments of the Congressional Science Fellowships in Child Development Program and other research and training programs with similar goals.